Studies in English

Volume 1 Article 14

1960

Vol. 1 (1960): Full issue

Studies in English

Department of English
The University of Mississippi

The University of Mississippi

STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Volume One

This volume is dedicated to **David Horace Bishop,** A.B., A.M., LL.D., Professor Emeritus of English Language and Literature, and Dean Emeritus of the Graduate School

University, Mississippi

1960

David Horace Bishop

My association with Professor David Horace Bishop is one of the rich experiences of my life. As a freshman in the University, I knew him as a distinguished professor of English, who demanded the highest standards of performance from his students. Later, the excellence of his scholarship and teaching and the encouragement and sympathy which he gave his students were important factors in my decision to select the teaching of English as my profession. Professor Bishop spent many weary hours directing my master's thesis so that I might produce the best paper of which I was capable. He was never satisfied with the second best for himself. I shall always be grateful that he applied the same standards to his students. My feeling is shared by all the hundreds of students who have studied under Dr. Bishop, and I should like to quote from many of them, but there is room here to include the tribute of only one, Stark Young, who has written to express his "great respect for Dr. Bishop" and his "devotion to and admiration of him."

Professor Bishop's courses in Shakespeare, the Romantic Poets, and the Victorian Poets were somehow more than courses—they were integral parts of life itself, real experiences in which the art and the ideas of men fired the imagination and thereby created something new in the mind and in the spirit.

A thorough scholar, a master teacher, and a keen judge of men, Professor Bishop developed over the years an outstanding Department of English at the University. As Dean of the Faculty and Chairman of the Library Committee, he never lost sight of the primary importance of books and scholars in the life of the University.

Professor Bishop laid the firm foundations of scholarship, integrity, superior teaching, and a scholarly faculty on which the present doctoral program in English is based. Without his significant contributions, the second half-century of the University of Mississippi would not be so distinguished nor prospects for her future so bright.

W. ALTON BRYANT, *Provost and Professor of English*

CONTENTS

Chaucer's "Sir Thopas": Meter, Rhyme, and Contrast

A. Wigfall Green

CHAUCER'S "Sir Thopas," as Skeat points out,[1] appears in the edition of Thomas Tyrwhitt and in the black-letter editions as "The ryme of Sir Thopas." The title is apt, for Chaucer was quite conscious of the meter and rhyme of his tale.

The prologue of "Sir Thopas" immediately follows "The Prioresses Tale," a tender story of martyrdom befittingly told in rhyme royal. The prologue, also in rhyme royal but consisting of only three stanzas, has a tenderness too, but a humorous tenderness. Chaucer agrees, with pretended modesty, to tell the only tale he knows, "a rym I lerned longe agoon."[2] The host then announces that Chaucer will tell some "deyntee thyng," and the dainty thing becomes so highly attenuated that it is easily broken off by the host.

After the host interrupts Chaucer and says that his ears ache because "of thy drasty speche," the word *rym* or variant is used five times in nine verses. The host commits such rhyme to the devil and calls it "rym dogerel." Chaucer feigning injury, says that it is the best rhyme that he knows. The host then contemptuously calls "Sir Thopas" "drasty rymyng" and commands that Chaucer "no lenger ryme."[3] This intimidation of Chaucer appears appropriately in heroic couplets, as does the rest of the epilogue to "Sir Thopas."

Sir Thopas is such a transparent precious stone that his name is taken from the topaz, just as the pearl becomes a simile for Sir

Gawain.[4] Although Sir Thopas is said ironically to be a "doghty swayn," a hard rider and a hard hunter, he is a marionette, fastidious in dress, fragile in appearance, and diminutive in size. Michael Drayton, more than any other author, shows a sensitive understanding of Sir Thopas in his "Nimphidia The Covrt of Fayrie," inspired by "OLDE CHAVCER" and his "Topas." In "Nimphidia," for example, the walls of the royal palace are made of spiders' legs and the windows of the eyes of cats; the royal chariot, a snail shell, is drawn by "Foure nimble Gnats."

In the prologue Chaucer adroitly prepares for the entrance of Sir Thopas by projecting his own consciousness into that of Sir Thopas. Except for his belly, as large as that of the host and impossible of reduction, Chaucer[5] diminishes himself to a pygmy. The host says that he is a "popet" (OF *poupette*), a puppet or a dolly worthy to be embraced by "any womman, smal and fair of face." There is also something "elvyssh," or fay-like, in his countenance.[6] When later[7] Sir Thopas seeks an "elf-queene" to love, the reader accepts readily the coalescence of the image of Chaucer and that of Sir Thopas in the preternatural mirror.

The persiflage of "Sir Thopas" has long been recognized. Richard Hurd calls it "*a manifest banter,*" and Thomas Percy says that it was written "in ridicule" of the romance.[8] Skeat and Robinson accept the poem as burlesque.

The narrative method is obviously satirical: the story is halted in the first fit to introduce animals of the forest in stanza eight, herbs in nine, birds in ten, and drink in twenty-two. Chaucer names romances of the type that he is burlesquing in the second stanza of the second fit; verse 848 of the first fit also satirizes the romance. Chaucer is aware of the pun in *fit* although it is a common name for a group of stanzas in the romance. He is, of course, jesting in his description of the appearance of Sir Thopas in stanza three of the first fit and of the dress and accouterments in stanzas four and twenty-three through twenty-seven. Badinage also appears in the "queene of Fayerye" and the "geaunt with hevdes three" in Chaucer's Lilliput.

In the same spirit Sir Thopas is made horsy: *steede* is used six times, and *berynge* and *dextier* appear as synonyms; *ride(n)* is used

four times, and *ambil, sadel,* and *brydel* once. The tempo of the poem is made furiously swift through the hard-riding of Sir Thopas: *prike* or variant appears eight times in the first fit, and in the second fit, third stanza, Sir Thopas "glood / As sparcle out of the bronde."

Many of the rhymes are studied burlesque: in stanza eleven humor is achieved through contrast: Sir Thopas pauses to hear the thrush *sing;* his steed is so sweaty that men can *wring* the blood from his sides. In stanza sixteen, kindred monsters, Olifaunt and Termagaunt, create amusing rhyme.

Although Chaucer makes the host refer to "Sir Thopas" as "rym dogerel," or burlesque verse of irregular meter, John Matthews Manly says that the eight types of stanza are but variations of one basic type, the whole poem being a "*tour de force* of high spirits."[9]

Granting that Chaucer was burlesquing meter and rhyme in "Sir Thopas," it is not improbable that he was demonstrating his virtuosity and even experimenting in verse forms. Chaucer speaks of the variety of his poems and of his meter and rhyme in *The Legend of Good Women:*

> And many an ympne for your halydayes,
> That highten balades, roundels, virelayes; (F, 422-423)
> He hath maad many a lay and many a thing. (F, 430)

In the same poem Love speaks to Chaucer:

> Make the metres of hem as the lest. (F, 562)
> I wot wel that thou maist nat al yt ryme. (F, 570)

The meter and rhyme[10] of the "deyntee thyng" called "Sir Thopas" are so complex that they can be indicated best in outline form:

Stanza(s)	*Number of Verses in Each Stanza*	*Rhyme Scheme*	*Number of Feet in Each Verse (All Iambic)*
		PROLOGUE	
1-3	7	ababbcc (rhyme royal)	5
		THE FIRST FIT	
1-13	6	aab/aab	443/443
14	7	aab/c/bbc	443/1/443
15	10	aab/aab/c/aac	443/443/1/443
16	10	aab/aab/c/ddc	443/443/1/443
17	10	aab/ccb/d/ccd	443/443/1/443

Stanza(s)	*Number of Verses in Each Stanza*	*Rhyme Scheme*	*Number of Feet in Each Verse (All Iambic)*
18	6	aab/ccb	443/443
19-22		The same as 1-13	
23-24		The same as 18	
25		The same as 1-13 and 19-22	
26		The same as 18 and 23-24	
27	10	aab/ccb/d/eed	443/443/1/443

THE SECOND FIT

1-5	(No. 5 has only three and one-half verses)	The same as 18, 23-24, and 26

Repeated rhyme is as follows:[11]

		Other Stanza(s)	
		PROLOGUE	
1-3	None within prologue		
		THE FIRST FIT	
1	*solas-Thopas*	12	*was-gras-plas-solas*
		18	*Thopas-gras*
2	*contree-see-free-contree*	13	*benedicite-me-pardee-be*
		17	*thee-thee*
		20	*he-glee-three-jolitee*
		1 (second fit)	*charitee-free*
	place-grace	16	*mace-place*
4	*saffroun-adoun-broun-syklatoun*	23	*aketoun-haubergeoun*
5	*honde-stonde*	27	*londe-fonde*
		3 (second fit)	*bronde-shonde*
	deer-river-archeer-peer	4 (second fit)	*wonger-dextrer* (proximate)
6	*bour-paramour-lechour-flour*	24	*cote-armour-flour*
		2 (second fit)	*Pleyndamour-flour*
		3 (second fit)	*tour-flour*
7	*day-may-gray-launcegay*	10	*nay-papejay-lay-spray*
		17	*fay-launcegay-may-day*
		27	*gray-way*
	ride-side	25	*bisyde-bityde*
9	*smale-cetewale-ale-stale*	19	*tale-nightyngale-smale-dale*
10	*heere-cleere*	23	*leere-cleere*
11	*longynge-synge-prikynge-wrynge*	18	*slynge-berynge*
		21	*armynge-likynge*
	wood-blood	3 (second fit)	*bistrood-glood*
15	*t'espye-Fairye*	16	*Fayerye-symphonye*

Stanza	*Rhyme*	*Other Stanza(s)*
		22 *spicerye-trye*
	anon-stoon-goon-woon-noon-goon	26 *boon-shoon*
16	*dede-steede*	5 (second fit) *wede*

THE SECOND FIT

1	*chivalry-love-drury*	2 (second fit) *Gy-chivalry*

EPILOGUE

Verses		*Other Verses*	
2109-2110	*dignitee-me*	2115-2116	*he-me*
2111-2112	*lewednesse-blesse*	2139-2140	*lesse-expresse*
2113-2114	*speche-biteche*	2143-2144	*biseche-speche*
2137-2138	*sentence-difference*	2151-2152	*sentence-difference*
2149-2150	*seye-preye*	2155-2156	*seye-preye*

From the preceding analysis, it appears that, in addition to the rhyme royal of the prologue and the decasyllabic verse, or heroic couplet, of the epilogue, only seven varieties of rhyme are used in "Sir Thopas" proper. Although Chaucerian pronunciation does not admit of rhyme between *thee-thee* and *fay-launcegay* in stanza 17 of the first fit, if it did, this stanza would have a rhyme scheme similar to that of stanza fifteen and there would be but six varieties of rhyme. In this connection, *solas-Thopas* of stanza one of the first fit do not rhyme with *place-grace* of stanza two, accepted by Manly as rhymes in his paper previously cited. The various types of rhyme are

1. 6-verse stanza rhyming aab/aab or aab/ccb
2. 7-verse stanza rhyming aab/c/bbc, obviously a variant of the second type of 6-verse stanza
3. 10-verse stanza rhyming aaa/aab/c/aac, aab/aab/c/ddc, aab/ccb/d/ccd, or aab/ccb/d/eed; the two middle types are but variants of each other.

More successive rhymes appear in the second fit than in the first: the first and second stanzas are linked by *chivalry-love-drury* and *Gy-chivalry,* and the second and third by *Pleyndamour-flour* and *tour-flour.* The second fit also contains more near-rhyme: *spelle-telle* of the first stanza approximate *well-Percyvell* of the fifth, and *bistrood-glood* of the third stanza *hoode-goode* of the fourth.

Stanzas are linked through repetition. Sometimes the narrative linking is remote and suspense is created: "a greet geaunt" appears in stanza sixteen; he reappears in eighteen; but it is only in twenty that

we learn how awesome he is; he disappears, while Thopas drinks and dresses lavishly, until twenty-five, when Thopas swears anticlimactically, "the geaunt shal be deed, Bityde what bityde!" The giant is used to link stanzas medially and terminally; the elf-queen is used with more subtlety to link stanzas: she appears internally four times in stanzas thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen. Litotes is used skillfully in delicate situations: love has bound Thopas "so soore" in thirteen that he dreams of "An elf-queene." An intentional pun appears when, in the land of "the queene of Fayerye," Thopas indulges in a fay-like oath, "*par ma fay.*"

The number of feet in each stanza is handled with charm and consistency: the six-verse stanza has the pattern 443/443; the seven-verse stanza is also perfectly symmetrical, 443/1/443; the ten-verse stanza is consistent with the seven-verse stanza, but it introduces three verses at the beginning which create variety within a symmetrical pattern, 443/443/1/443. The introduction of the verse of one foot required great poetic skill; an apparent artlessness is achieved only through great art.

Much of the humor of the tale is created through rhyme. Time, setting, and major character are introduced in stanza seven with a flourish of rhyme: "upon a day," "as I yow telle may," Sir Thopas is on his "steede gray," in his hand "a launcegay"; subsequent stanzas continue the rhyme: "it is no nay" that "the papejay" sang and the "thrustelcok made eek his lay" and the "wodedowve" was "upon the spray"; "Also moote I thee," said Thopas to the giant, "I meete with thee," and "*par ma fay,*" "with this launcegay," thy maw shall I pierce "if I may" ere "pryme of day"; Thopas on his steed "al dappull gray" ambles "in the way." An eerie atmosphere is also achieved through rhyme within a given stanza, as in sixteen: "a greet geaunt" named "Olifaunt," swearing "by Termagaunt!" orders Thopas out of his "haunt." Many a maiden, in six, "bright in bour," mourns for Thopas "paramour," but he is "no lechour" but sweet as "the brembul flour"; symbolic of his purity, in twenty-four, is his "cote-armour," "whit as is a lilye flour"; in two of the second fit, he knows the romances like "Pleyndamour," but of royal chivalry Thopas "bereth the flour."

Today the comparison of Sir Thomas Wyatt in "Of the Courtiers

life written to Iohn Poins," Satire III,

> I am not he that can . . .
> Praise syr Topas for a noble tale,
> And scorne the story that the knight tolde

seems unnatural because of a different conception of the purpose of Chaucer in creating the Knight and his tale and Sir Thopas and his tale. Yet the method of Chaucer is comparable but antithetic: the Knight is a very human crusader, although idealized, who has fought in specific places; the tale, although having a hierarchy of gods, planets, kings and queens, and knights, is localized in the Athens area and develops as a narrative. Sir Thopas is a subhuman-superhuman knight with human qualities; although he was born in Flanders, he wanders all over the "contree of Fairye" and, like the tale, arrives nowhere. Even in the creation of a serious character like the Knight, there is a genial play of comedy in description: after Chaucer expends twenty-five verses in enumerating the glorious accomplishments of the hardy soldier, he says in the General Prologue, 69, "And of his port as meeke as is a mayde." And surely the comic spirit is mildly glowing when, toward the end of "The Knight's Tale," 2808-2810, Arcite dies with the words, "Mercy, Emelye!" on his lips and his "spirit chaunged house" and went where "I cam nevere, I kan nat tellen wher"; when the mourning Palamon appears, 2883-2884, with "flotery berd and ruggy, asshy heeres," in "clothes blake, ydropped al with teeres"; and when the wake-games are held, 2960-2962, and Chaucer asserts his inability to tell who "wrastleth best naked with oille enoynt."

The flights of tragedy lightened by flashes of subtle comedy in "The Knight's Tale" become flights of humor in "Sir Thopas." The opening of the poem gives the hope of seeing a valiant knight in action; but Chaucer's pictorial characterization of Sir Thopas soon becomes the reverse of what was expected; the descent to weakness is rapid, but equally swift is the ascent to chivalric elegance; and it is soon discovered that Chaucer is using the method of opposites in flashing his wit upon the reader. The weakness and strength of Sir Thopas become the weakness and strength of the reader, who oscillates between scorn and sympathy for Thopas as for himself.

Contrast, or irony, begins with the prologue to "Sir Thopas":

because of the sombreness of "The Prioresses Tale," every man is sober, and the Host begins to jest. This contrast appears also in the sex drive of Thopas: he was "chaast and no lechour," but he dreamed of an elf-queen who should "slepe under my goore"; he then set off posthaste to find an elf-queen to be his mate. The dream is like that in *The Romaunt of the Rose,* 2569-2572, in which the image of the maiden comes to the man, who has her "Naked bitwene thyne armes there." That Thopas should forsake all other women in the flesh, those of the town and "Ful many a mayde" who mourned for "hym paramour" and seek a nebulous elf is in the spirit of contrast and not unlike "many a wight" in *Troilus and Criseyde,* V, 164-165, who has "loved thyng he nevere saigh his lyve." In accordance with the courtly tradition of love, the knight must be in love with the idea of love more than with the figure of woman, even though the figure may be in the mind of the man. The maiden must always be unattainable in the body, for, as in *The Romaunt of the Rose,* 5053-5056, man should value little "hir, that wole hir body selle." The great duke Theseus, of "The Knight's Tale," surprisingly enough conquers "al the regne of Femenye" and wins and weds "The queene Ypolita"; in reverse, it is surprising and pleasing that in the land of elves and giants of "Sir Thopas," where even the giant Olifaunt swears "by Termagaunt!" Thopas never meets, never woos, and never wins the elf-queen. Marriage by Thopas would have ended in the spoliation of the chastity of Thopas and of the tale.

Dissimilitude appears also in the person of Thopas. He is a knight "fair and gent" in "bataille and in tourneyment" and a "doghty swayn," but his face is white "as payndemayn." In rhyme, vocabulary, and juxtaposition of conflicting images, Chaucer has lifted mere burlesque to the realm of high comedy. Chaucer seems to be contemptuous of the Frere when he makes his "nekke whit" as "the flour-de-lys" (General Prologue, *The Canterbury Tales,* 238), but he is here smiling good-humoredly at, and with, Thopas. His complexion is "lyk scarlet," his "lippes rede as rose," and he "hadde a semely nose." So the third stanza ends with delightful anticlimax. He is not unlike the "grete Emetreus," of "The Knight's Tale," 2168, with "lippes rounde" and "colour . . . sangwyn." Carroll Camden, Jr.,

makes the point that Chaucer was an excellent physiognomist,[12] but he was also an expert in the use of extremes. It is more appropriate that Thopas, the mediaeval Tom Thumb, have a "semely nose" than that, like the miller in "The Reeve's Tale," 3934, his nose should be "camus" or, like the Miller of the General Prologue, 554-557, his nose should be adorned with a wart on which "stood a toft of herys" as red as the bristles "of a sowes erys." His hair and his beard are "lyk saffroun," somewhat darker than that of Emetreus ("The Knight's Tale," 2167), whose hair "was yelow, and glytered as the sonne." But Chaucer was not content to say only that the beard of Thopas was "lyk saffroun"; he heightens his comedy by adding that the beard "to his girdel raughte adoun." The diminutive Thopas would naturally have "sydes smale," not unlike the Clerk, (General Prologue 288-289), who "nas nat right fat," but "looked holwe."

To the costuming and equipage of Sir Thopas, Chaucer devotes the greater part of six stanzas. Symbolic of his purity, Thopas stuck a "lilie flour" in the tower of his crest, and his "cote-armour" is "whit as is a lilye flour." Chaucer's apprenticeship in costuming was served in his translation of *The Romaunt of the Rose*. In this work (2251-2261) "queynt array" or "fresh array" or "fair clothyng" is "nothyng proud," and garments should be styled by "hym that kan best do." In the *Romaunt* also (2263-2284) the gentleman is told all about points and sleeves, shoes and boots, gloves and purses for alms, and hats "of flours as fresh as May" with chaplet "of roses of Whitsonday." In the *Romaunt* the gentleman must also "hondis wassh," "teeth make white," and quickly clean "nailes blak." The costuming of Thopas is but pleasantly humorous as compared to the bravura passages of "The Knight's Tale," (2129-2178), in which Lygurge comes forth resplendent in rubies and diamonds and Emetreus in pearls and rubies, like the carbuncle in Sir Thopas' shield.

In drink also Chaucer, son and grandson of a vintner, is an epicure. Had Thopas "vernysshed his heed" or the "joly whistle wel ywet," as did the miller and his wife of "The Reeve's Tale" (4149 and 4155), he would have been very indelicate. The *bon vivant* Sir Thopas is fetched "sweete wyn" and "mede," but he drinks only "water of the

well." Chaucer says in *The Romaunt of the Rose* (5709-5710) that he receives "a gret peyne" who "undirtakith to drynke up Seyne."

Sir Thopas is a great sportsman. Like Chaucer's monk, whose greatest pleasure (General Prologue 191) is "huntyng for the hare," Sir Thopas rides hard "thurgh a fair forest," in which "is many a wilde best." He also hunts "wilde deer" and goes "an haukyng for river." Like the Yeoman, he is "a good archeer," and at "wrastlyng was ther noon his peer"; like the Miller, he always won the ram as prize. *Vis-a-vis* Sir Thopas, armed with lance and long sword, is the triple-headed "greet geaunt" named Olifaunt, armed not with spiked mace but slingshot.

Contrast is woven also into the stageset of Chaucer's tale. Thopas was born "in fer contree," or Flanders, and he wears the fine hose of that country; he is now in mediaeval England, but this has been metamorphosed into the "contree of Fairye," ruled by "the queene of Fayerye." A nebulous town exists, in which there are women, but none, Sir Thopas says elegantly, "Worthy to be my make." There are also shadowy maidens in bowers who mourn for him, but he will court only the elf-queen. Although no "wyf ne childe" dare ride or walk toward him, even these are obscured by the ancient, wild forests through which Thopas rides. Sire Olifaunt, the giant, appears and threatens to slay not the miniature Thopas, but Thopas' horse, the most realistic character in the tale. Herbs and trees are painted on the backdrop. A chorus of birds sings lustily, sparrowhawk, popinjay, throstle cock, wood-dove, and thrush. Despite the detail, Thopas' Utopia is a vacuum.

Contrast appears also in the tempo of the work: the lingering effect of stanza twenty-three, in which Thopas begins to dress, is markedly different from the leaping of Thopas in fifteen "over stile and stoon." Thopas, conceived as a midge, perfectly formed but diminutive in size, is something of a phenomenon: since he is a child in size, one would expect him to be juvenile in manner. But Chaucer again uses antithesis and makes Thopas heroic in attitude. He dares, as in stanza seven, to ride through the forest, where there is "many a wilde best." Immediately thereafter, as if by contraremonstrance, Chaucer adds, "Ye, bothe bukke and hare," and each "wilde best" is counterpassant, as on

a mediaeval escutcheon, emblematic of the two techniques of Chaucer and the two natures of Thopas.

As a man, Sir Thopas is, indeed, a gem; as a tale, "Sir Thopas" is one of great "myrthe and of solas."

---

[1]*The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer . . . Notes to the Canterbury Tales,* ed. Walter W. Skeat, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1924), p. 183.

[2]*The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* ed. Fred N. Robinson, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1957), p. 164, v. 709. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations are from this work.

[3]Robinson, p. 167, vv. 924-932.

[4]"Sir Gawain and the Green Knight," v. 2364.

[5]Chaucer is "rounde of shap" in v. 31, "Lenvoy de Chaucer a Scogan." See Thomas A. Knott, "A Bit of Chaucer Mythology," *MP,* VIII (1910), 135-139.

[6]Vv. 700-703, prologue.

[7]The First Fit, vv. 788, 790, 795, and 799.

[8]Quoted by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion 1357-1900* (Cambridge, 1925), I, 422 and 427.

[9]"The Stanza-forms of Sir Thopas," *MP,* VIII (1910), 141-144.

[10]Henry Cromie includes "Sir Thopas" in his *Ryme-index* (London, 1875), but his method does not admit of assembly of rhymes in that work.

[11]Stanza numbers are those of the first fit unless otherwise indicated.

[12]"The Physiognomy of Thopas," *RES,* XI (1935), 326-330.

Milton's Eve And The Other Eves

Dudley R. Hutcherson

EVE OF *Paradise Lost* is one of the greatest women of literature, magnificent, feminine, human, and a masterpiece of psychological characterization. Is she Milton's creation, or was she inherited almost entirely from the tradition? By what means does Milton achieve Eve's portrait, and does it surpass that by any other writer?

The reason for Eve Milton accepted from *Genesis:* "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him." In *Tetrachordon* Milton had written "that there is a peculiar comfort in the married state besides the genial bed, which no other society affords."[1] He expresses this purpose again in *De Doctrina Christiana:* "God gave a wife to man at the beginning that she should be his help and solace and delight."[2] *Paradise Lost* differs from Genesis, however, in that it is Adam, not God, who first states Adam's need for a mate. This variation was not original. Milton had read in Rashi's commentary in the Bomberg Bible that Adam, observing the animals, male and female, had lamented "for all of them there is a help meet, but for me there is no help meet."[3]

The physical loveliness of Milton's Eve was in part an inheritance from many women, some of whom had been called Eve. The poet's recollections of the glorious women of mythology contributed to her creation. Milton compares Eve by direct or indirect allusion with Juno, Pandora, Aphrodite, Hera, Athena, a wood nymph, an oread or

dryad, Delia, Pales, Pomona, and Ceres. Twenty-seven other women or groups of women from mythology are also mentioned in *Paradise Lost,* but not in connection with Eve.[4] That there are in Milton's poetry before *Paradise Lost* 225 references to the women of mythology also suggests that the poet's conception of feminine appearance and character would be affected by his knowledge of the women in Greek and Roman legends. In Homer and the Homeric hymns there is, however, very little physical description of women. Their beauty is conveyed mainly by epithet and incident. From these sources Milton did not derive the details of Eve's loveliness, but he could have learned the method of presenting feminine beauty by general means rather than in specific terms, a technique appropriate to the epic.

In *Genesis* the woman is not described. Jewish tradition praises Eve's "surprising beauty and grace," but only after it has been stressed that "Eve was but as an ape compared with Adam."[5] Avitus, a major influence in the tradition whom Milton almost certainly had read, has Satan describe Eve as the most beautiful maiden and the ornament of all the world, but the author adds that Eve unjustly accepts these compliments.[6] The Eve of *Genesis B* of the Caedmon poems is the "loveliest of women" and "the lovely maid, fairest of women."[7] Although Junius, to whom Bishop Ussher gave the Caedmon manuscript, lived in London until 1651, there is no evidence that Milton knew these poems; nowhere does Milton indicate an interest in any Old English literature. Some Renaissance commentators questioned whether Woman was made in the image of God, but Pererius, Pareus, and others agreed that she wore God's image, although she was much less like him than was Adam.[8]

Spenser's influence on *Paradise Lost is* for the most part general rather than specific, but it has been suggested[9] that one direct association may be in Adam's description to Raphael of his vision of Eve in which Milton may have recalled King Arthur's account of his dream of the "royall maid" who beside him

> Her dainty limbes full softly down did lay:
> So faire a creature yet saw never sunny day.

Lavish praise of Eve's appearance is found in the treatments of the Creation and Fall in late sixteenth and in seventeenth century

writing. Milton read in Joshua Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas that Eve possessed all of Adam's beauty and could scarcely have been distinguished from him:

> Saving that she had a more smiling Eye,
> A smoother Chin, a cheek of purer Dye,
> A fainter Voyce, a more inticing Face,
> A deeper Tress, a more delighting Grace,
> And in her Bosom (more than Lillie-White)
> Two swelling Mounts of Ivory, panting Light.[10]

The young poet who visited in Paris the famous Hugo Grotius, the Dutch ambassador to France, certainly must have read the great man's *Adamus Exul* in which the Earth and Adam admire Eve's preeminent beauty.[11] Milton probably knew also Andeini's *L'Adamo,* published in 1613; in this work Eve is celebrated as sole joy of the world and man's delight, and is, according to the disguised Lucifer, a fair maiden who dazzles all eyes, and the noblest ornament of the world.[12] Peyton's *Glasse of Time* praised Eve's "glorious beauty chaste."[13] If Milton read or had read to him Joseph Beaumont's *Psyche or Love's Mystery,* printed in 1648, he found in it a much more detailed description of Eve's physical qualities than he attempted in *Paradise Lost.* Beaumont praises her as "Topstone of the goodly-fram'd Creation," "The Crown of *Nature,*" and "that *final Creature.*"[14] He then devotes thirteen six-line stanzas to the account in sensuous detail of Eve's beauty. "Symmetry rejoyc'd in every Part," the poet declares in conclusion:

> From heav'n to earth, from head to foot I mean,
> No Blemish could by Envy's self be seen.

In Salandra's *Adamo Caduto,* published in 1647, Adam recites the superiority of the parts of Eve's body to various objects of natural beauty. He declares also that if he did not know Eve had been made from his flesh, her beauty would convince him that she was a goddess, and that she is a heaven more lovely than heaven itself.[15]

What paintings and sculpture of Eve Milton had seen, and whether he recalled these works as he created his heroine can be only speculation. The young English visitor in Florence must have admired, though, Ghiberti's bronze doors on the Baptistery of San

Giovanni on which the first of the ten masterpieces of relief sculpture depicts the creation of Adam and Eve, the temptation, and the expulsion. It would seem likely also that in Bologna Milton saw "The Sin of Adam and Eve" by Jacopo della Querica on the main portal of S. Petronio. Certainly in Rome he would have been taken by his friends to view Michelangelo's paintings in the Sistine Chapel. Eve's physical qualities may have been affected also by the poet's recollections of paintings and statues of other lovely women.

What part, if any, the girls from Milton's youth or from his youthful imagination had in the creation of Eve is also speculation. Against the screen of his blindness the poet may have seen again at times the "virgin groups" of Elegy I, the girl supreme above the rest of Elegy VII, and the dark Emilia of the Italian sonnets. He may have been stirred also by the recollection of the sensuousness of Elegy V.

No one knows, either, what was contributed by Milton's three wives to the lovely Eve. Her body is warm and soft, with a reality that a man could scarcely know but through experience.

Milton's Eve has a rare physical beauty, clothed in great poetry, whatever the sources of her being in the poet's reading or in his experience. It is not that certain other writers had not shown an equal interest in Eve's physical magnificence; a number of other authors actually give much more attention to the details of Eve's body than does Milton. The effect that Milton achieves is, however, unequalled. God calls her "fair Eve," and Milton, "the fairest of her Daughters *Eve*," using the same term or its superlative many times.

> She as a vail down to the slender waste
> Her unadorned golden tresses wore
> Disshevl'd,

and in the embrace,

> half her swelling Breast
> Naked met his under the flowing Gold
> Of her loose tresses hid.

Not for the most part through such details as these, however, for other specific details do not occur, is Milton uniquely successful. Instead, by a fortuitous combination of general terms he evokes a vision

of supreme loveliness. The creation is the result of a dozen-odd passages woven into the narrative, and if all these lines are brought together, the reader understands, as perhaps he had only felt before, the impact of

> Her loveliness, so absolute she seems
> And in her self compleat.

Milton also achieves as no other writer a sense of the glory of Eve's nakedness:

> Undeckt, save with her self, more lovely fair
> Than Wood-Nymph, or the fairest Goddess feign'd
> Of three that in Mount Ida naked strove.

So lovely was she as at table she "minsterd naked" that

> if ever, then,
> Then had the Sons of God excuse to have bin
> Enamour'd at that sight.

Of Eve's character and her relationship with Adam before the Fall, Milton learned from *Genesis* that she was made to be a help meet, that man and wife shall be one flesh, and that she, like Adam, was unashamed of her nakedness. Milton's debt to the Narcissus story for Eve's first experience and the similarity of her willfulness to Dido's have been suggested.[16] Early hexameral literature added little to the portrait of Eve in *Genesis*. According to Jewish legend, after Lilith deserted Adam, he was given Eve as a "true companion," but he perceived also that she would try to gain her desires by entreaty and tears, or flattery and caresses, and he concluded, "this is my never-silent bell."[17] Rashi explains that the term *help meet,* which Milton also discussed in *Tetrachordon,* "(literally *help-as-over-against him*) . . . means if he is lucky a help; if unlucky, an antagonist with whom to fight."[18] Rashi also interpreted *Genesis* to mean that the man, who is to subdue and dominate the female, is commanded to be fruitful and multiply, and not the woman.[19] Philo of Alexandria advanced the view that as soon as Eve was made, Adam's life became blameworthy.[20] Avitus does not depict Eve before the temptation, but as soon as the serpent approaches her, she immediately reveals her credulousness and her ambitions.[21] Eve of the Caedmonian *Genesis B* lacks the majesty of Milton's figure, but in other attributes she is

perhaps the most attractive and appealing characterization before *Paradise Lost.*

The reason for Eve's existence — and for the existence of women — was strongly argued in the commentaries of the Renaissance, whether she was created merely as a reproductive machine or whether she was made primarily for a help meet and companion.[22] In support of the latter view, Pareus, whose definition of marriage as "an indissoluble conjunction of one man and one woman to an individual and intimate conversation and mutual benevolence" Milton quotes in *Tetrachordon,* named five ways in which woman helps man. The Renaissance commentators were in agreement that Eve had a soul, but they were uncertain where this soul came from. They also stressed that Eve understood and happily accepted her subordination to Adam.

In Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas, Milton had read that the "Queen of the World" "so purely kept her Vow of chastity" that except only "in fained form" Satan "in vain should tempt her Constancy,"[23] and then the apparently contradictory statement that Satan assaults:

> The part he finds in evident defaults:
> Namely, poor Woman, wavering, weak, unwise,
> Light, credulous, given to lies.[24]

In *Adamus Exul* Satan describes woman as light-minded, disobedient, variable, prideful, self-indulgent, selfish, curious, and restless.[25] Eve in her conversation with Adam seems, however, very sincere and humbly concerned for her husband's happiness as her chief pleasure. As soon as Andreini's Adam saw Eve, he praised her as his beloved companion.[26] Thomas Peyton states that God had provided Adam with "so choice a mate" and "ring'd her with virtue, glorious beauty chaste."[27] In Salandra's *Adamo Caduto* God tells Adam that Eve is his help meet and like him, not in sex, but in soul, although later Eve seems frivolous and imperfect.[28] Beaumont is as expansive in praise of Eve's other qualities as of her beauty.[29] Pordage describes Adam's great joy in Eve.[30] Vondel's Eve is praised in superlative terms by Gabriel and Adam, and she appears a lively, intelligent, and devoted mate; yet Asmodeus and Lucifer decide to assail her because she is weaker than Adam and is vulnerable because of her love of dainties.[31] There

is no evidence of the direct influence of Shakespeare's heroines, but it has been said "that Eve in her infinite variety, suggests Desdemona and Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra."[32]

Thus it appears that the basic qualities of Eve before the Temptation that Milton used are found in the tradition. Milton developed these elements into a living personality, but representative of humanity, with the attributes of attractive perfection, yet warm, soft, human, clothed in the magic of his language, so that she stands apart from and far above the line from which she is descended. Milton's Eve is the epitome of "sweet attractive grace," whose cheek is altered by "no thought infirm." Adam describes to the Angel his great delight in Eve's "graceful acts,/ Those thousand decencies that daily flow/ From all her words and actions mixed with Love/ And sweet compliance." Adam later was to remember her as "last and best/ Of all Gods works in whom excell'd/ Whatever can to sight or thought be formd,/ Holy, divine, good, amiable or sweet!" Both understood their relationship: "Hee for God only, shee for God in him." For Adam, though, she was "Heav'ns last best gift, my ever new delight," "Best Image of my self and dearer half," and "Sole partner and sole part of all these joyes/ Dearer thy self then all . . ."

Eve's physical relations with Adam before the Fall have been the subject of much speculation. *Genesis* makes no statement about the matter, unless Rashi's comment on the first verse of Chapter Four is accepted: "*and the man knew his wife*. . . . Before he had sinned and had been banished from the Garden of Eden, even then had conception and birth [begun]."[33] In some legends of the Jews, God dressed Eve for the wedding, and the angels played music and danced afterwards, but nothing is said about the consummation.[34] Baldwin found no Christian authority for Satan's lust toward Eve nor for his envy of Adam's marital life; these ideas he discovered, however, in Josephus, the *Apocalypsis Mosis,* Beresith Rabbi, and other rabbis, along with insistence on the blamelessness of sexual life before the Fall.[35] Baldwin also noted often in midrashic tradition the notion that Adam became aware of the sexual instinct at his first sight of Eve. Philo states that the love which arose immediately between Adam and Eve led to the desire to produce their kind, which in turn led to bodily pleasure, and

the beginning of wrong.[36] Avitus tells of Adam and Eve's marriage, and states that Paradise was their bridal chamber, but turns immediately to a description of Paradise.[37] Saint Augustine takes an emphatic position: "But that blessing of marriage, for increase, multiplication, and peopling of the earth . . . was given them before sin that they might know the procreation of children belonged to the glory of marriage and not to the punishment of sin."[38] Augustine is equally insistent that although there were physical relations before the Fall, "their wedlock love was holy and honest," and they did not know lust.[39] Williams found in the Renaissance expositions a strong tradition that Eve and Adam were virgins before the Fall.[40] The Protestants opposed much more strongly than the Catholics, although some advanced Catholics agreed with them, the theory that Eve and Adam would have remained virgins if they had not sinned. The discussion, it will be noted, was whether there would ever have been conjugal relations. Only one or two Renaissance commentators accepted the possibility of love-making before the Fall. One common argument against a consummation was that of a lack of time.[41]

In Grotius, Eve and Adam talk of sharing their common love and rapture, but their language is not specific.[42] Andreini's Adam invites Eve to the purest, closest embraces; at Eve's suggestion they kneel to praise God, however, and the scene ends.[43] Eve and Adam's great beauty and God's command to multiply their kind are given by Lyndesay as the reasons they were not celibate before their sin.[44] Beaumont writes:

> Nor did their amorous hands and lips alone
> In most unspotted Pleasurer juncture wed,
> But in a nearer dearer union
> Their Thoughts all kiss'd, their Hearts were married.[45]

Milton, it is then evident, had authority in the tradition for his presentation of the marital relations of Eve and Adam before the Fall, although many writers had argued for celibacy or had ignored the matter. Milton's unique contribution is again not in the originality of the idea, but in the beauty of his poetry, in the effectiveness of his scene, and in the surpassing physical glory of his Eve. The two scenes of Adam and Eve's love-making, from which Satan turned in envy —

a reaction occasionally found also in the tradition — and of the "Rites/ Mysterious" with the apostrophe to wedded love, are anticipated but unmatched among Milton's predecessors.

Milton's dream temptation has no model in the literature of the tradition. Apparently from his imagination and from his knowledge of the human mind the poet fashioned the episode. In a few other versions Satan approaches Eve some time before he makes clear that he wants her to eat the fruit, but nothing occurs that resembles Milton's psychological probing of Eve's potential weakness. There is in the literature no antecedent either of the highly realistic love scene for which Eve's frightened awakening from her dream provides the opportunity. Eve enjoys on this occasion the attentions of a skilled lover. Although by Milton's own confession he was very naive in this aspect of life when he brought Mary Powell to London, he had learned much in the intervening years.

The first real interest in Eve in many versions of the tradition is at the beginning of the temptation, and nearly all who retold the story are much concerned with the woman's qualities that attracted the Tempter and with the manner of Satan's approach. In *Genesis* no stage is set for the Serpent's encounter with the woman, nor is any reason given for his choice of Eve unless the statement of the Serpent's precedence in subtlety implies that this attribute leads him to approach Eve rather than her husband. In *Vitae Adae et Evae* and in *Apocalypsis Mosis,* Adam on his deathbed recalled that the Adversary had assailed Eve when she was away from her husband.[46] Jewish legend and rabbinical tradition explain that the Serpent chose Eve because he knew that woman is easily beguiled.[47] Yosippon has the Serpent make a casual, conversational approach to Eve in the manner that Milton also employs but with more detail.[48] Yosippon, the *Apocalypsis Mosis,* Beresith Rabbi, and Rashi, among others, state that Satan was motivated by his jealousy of Adam's conjugal relations with Eve.[49] Philo explains that Eve's mind was devoid of steadfastness and firm foundation.[50] The Serpent in Avitus, afraid that he could not tempt Adam, subtly and with soft words gains easily an audience with Eve.[51] That Satan knew that Eve was weaker and an easier

victim is found also in Peter Lombard, Hugo, Ainsworth, Bonaventure, Calvin, Grotius, Heywood, Mercer, Pererius, and Purchas.[52]

Satan in the Caedmon *Genesis B* assumes the guise of an angelic messenger who first approaches and is rejected by Adam. In great wrath Satan turns to Eve, whose soul had been made weaker, and whom he finds alone, and tells her God will be angry if he hears that she refused the command brought by his messenger to eat the fruit.[53] Eve's deception, and sympathetic portrayal, through her understandable credulity in believing that she has been approached by God's messenger has no Biblical authority, but it is not uncommon in apocryphal literature.[54] However much Milton knew these versions, he did not find their approach suitable to his story.

Eve's weakness or her credulity was given by most of Milton's immediate predecessors and by his contemporaries as the reason for her selection for the temptation. Milton read in Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas that Satan in serpent form assaulted the part of humanity he found in default, "namely, poor Woman, wavering, weak, unwise,/ Light, credulous, given to lies."[55] After Satan has been contemptuously rejected by Adam in *Adamus Exul,* he transforms himself into a beautiful serpent and approaches Eve when she is alone.[56] Beaumont's Satan, in serpent form, notes Eve's "soft Temper" and thinks she "might less impregnable than *Adam* be."[57] Lucifer, in serpent guise, in *L'Adamo* tells Eve that he is the gardener named "Wisdom," although he is sometimes called "Life."[58] Asmodeus in *Adam in Ballingschap* advises Satan to tempt Eve first because she is the weaker of the two and will be undone by her love of dainties.[59] Some accounts have Satan find Eve alone, without explanation of Adam's whereabouts. Salandra, however, causes Echo to lure the man away in a futile search,[60] and Vondel sends Adam to pray and to speak with God in solitude.[61]

Milton's contribution to this part of the story is the separation scene. In no other account is there anything comparable to the masterful dialogue of *Paradise Lost* in which Adam's logic and loving care are skillfully overcome by Eve's attractive willfulness and feminine guile.

In several other temptation scenes Satan addresses Eve in a man-

ner similar to the magnificent epithets he employs in Milton's story. Avitus,[62] Ramsey,[63] Beaumont,[64] and Pordage[65] are among the writers whose Tempter approached Eve with flattering titles and compliments. In *L'Adamo*[66] and in *Adam in Ballingschap*[67] the serpent's tribute to Eve is very profuse. Here again Milton's individuality is not in an original device, but in the beauty of his poetry. Milton's Satan also skillfully weaves the magnificent terms which are almost but not quite true, into the entire temptation, obtaining a total effect not found elsewhere. Eve's curiosity about the fact that the Serpent is speaking is common to Milton and many other accounts.

It is difficult for many readers of *Paradise Lost* to understand how the perfect Eve has become so naive and credulous that she can be persuaded by the Serpent to follow his joyous convolutions without realizing that he is leading her toward the forbidden tree. Milton tries to make gradual and reasonable Eve's action, although the effort may not be convincing. In the tradition, though, the Serpent usually made his proposal immediately and bluntly, although often Eve did not know the Serpent's identity.

In *Genesis* the Serpent tells Eve that she and Adam will not die, but that their eyes will be opened and they will become as gods. In Jewish legend,[68] Yosippon,[69] Avitus,[70] Peyton,[71] Pordage,[72] Quarles' *Emblems,*[73] and Salandra,[74] among other accounts, Eve either is told she will not die, or the Serpent points out that he has touched the fruit and is not dead. Eve and Adam will become as gods after they have eaten the fruit, the Serpent tells her in many accounts, including the *Apocalypsis Mosis,*[75] Jewish legend,[76] Avitus,[77] *Cursor Mundi,*[78] the Coventry,[79] Chester,[80] and York plays,[81] *Adamus Exul,*[82] *L'Adamo,*[83] *The Monarche,*[84] the *Glasse of Time,* [85] *Adam in Ballingschap,*[86] *Mundorum Explicato,*[87] and *Adamo Caduto.*[88] That the fruit will enable Eve and her husband to know good and evil is an argument used often, for example in *Apocalypsis Mosis,*[89] Philo,[90] and Grotius.[91] In Jewish legend the Tempter declares that God was prompted by malevolence.[92] Yosippon's Serpent states that God was jealous because the fruit would enable Eve and Adam to create worlds.[93] The Serpent of Grotius tells Eve that Fate controls everything and that whether she eats the fruit will not determine her death.[94] Andreini's Serpent

says that if they eat, he will gain revenge on God, and that also when they become gods, he will have the garden for himself.[95] Du Bartas presents a series of arguments similar to those in Milton[96] Thus, in one story or another the other Eves had been persuaded by the same arguments that Milton's Serpent employs. No other single Eve had listened, however, to the effective, powerful — and apparently logical — presentation of all the arguments offered in *Paradise Lost.* Milton is original here, not in what Satan says, but in the organization and force of his persuasion. If we ignore the puzzling question of how a perfect Eve could have been subject to Satan's wiles, it is easy to believe that Satan's arguments were too strong for anyone, but especially for a naive and inexperienced young woman.

Eve succumbs immediately to Satan's proposal in some accounts, but in others, as in *Paradise Lost,* she considers her action. Yosippon's Eve decides that Adam had not told her the truth, and, as in the *Zohar* and *Paradise Lost,* she indulges in a soliloquy before she eats.[97] Renaissance commentators analyzed Eve's mental reactions in terms of elaborate spiritual psychology of the state of the soul in relation to sin and virtue.[98] In Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas Milton read that before the fatal step was taken,

> — doth *Eve* shew by like fearfull fashions
> The doubtfull combat of contending Passions;
> She would, she should not; glad, sad, comes and goes.[99]

In *Adamus Exul* Eve's rebuttals grow weaker with each reply to Satan, and after a long soliloquy she succumbs.[100] The similarity of Hamlet's soliloquy to Eve's meditation in *Paradise Lost* was suggested by Professor Thaler.[101] The brief but sprightly dialogus of Quarles' emblem presents an Eve who decides that the fruit is nothing but an apple, and that it is no worse to do something than to want to do it.[102] Beaumont's Eve "thrice step'd to the inchanting *Tree,*/ As oft her Conscience pluck'd her back again" until at last "with uncheck'd Madness" she rushed to the fruit.[103] Eve in *Adamo Caduto* questions the Serpent's arguments point by point, but she is persuaded to touch the fruit; then, after placing it against her breast does not bring the changes she had been promised, she eats it.[104]

Milton recognizes and skillfully uses the opportunities offered by

the act of Eve's eating the fruit. In nearly all accounts, as in *Genesis,* Caedmon, Du Bartas, Grotius, and Andreini, the writer states merely that Eve eats the fruit. Avitus does declare that she devours it greedily,[105] and Beaumont states that she rushes to the tree with "uncheck'd Madness."[106] Milton's picture of Eve as "Greedily she ingorg'd without restraint" until "satiate at length,/ And hight'nd as with Wine, jocond and boon," concisely depicts the startling change in her character and prepares for her temptation of Adam and its aftermath.

Genesis does not consider Eve's motives in persuading Adam to eat the fruit, except perhaps for the implication that she believed that the qualities and promises which drew her to the tree would be equally attractive to Adam. Eve's fear that she will die and Adam will be given another wife is the prime motive, as it is in *Paradise Lost,* in many accounts, for example in the legends of the Jews,[107] in the *Zohar* in which Saurat found a striking resemblance to *Paradise Lost* in the scene after Eve eats the apple,[108] in Yosippon,[109] in Rashi,[110] and in several Renaissance commentators.[111] The Tempter in the Caedmon poem tells Eve she has been made more beautifully splendid and under this deception she goes to Adam.[112] Du Bartas sends her forthwith to Adam, apparently without thought of motive.[113] Salandra's Eve indulges in a long soliloquy, blaming herself, but also Adam for leaving her alone, and decides that Adam should share her fate.[114]

Du Bartas treats Eve's temptation of Adam concisely, stating that Eve "cunningly" added to the qualities of the fruit "her quaint smiling glances/ Her witty speech, and pretty countenances."[115] Before Eve took the fruit to Adam she covered herself with fig leaves, according to the *Book of Jubilees,*[116] and with a girdle of the plant of which she had eaten, according to the *Apocalypsis Mosis.*[117] The legends of the Jews describe Eve's use of tears and lamentations to persuade Adam to eat, and state that she also gave the fruit to all other living creatures so that they too might be subject to death.[118] Saint Augustine comments that Eve was deceived by the Serpent, but that Adam, although he was aware of the deception, yielded because of his social love for Eve.[119] The Eve of the Caedmon poems, having believed that

Satan is God's messenger who if she eats will not tell God that Adam refused to eat, with good intentions finally persuades Adam to eat.[120]

The Adam of Grotius is as greatly shocked as Milton's when he learns of Eve's act, but his alarm and despair are less dramatically effective.[121] Adam, as Eve pleads, debates his choice between love of God and of the woman; he decides that God has willed that love of woman is stronger, and accepts the fruit. In *L'Adamo* Adam is torn for a few minutes between the desire to obey God and the desire not to lose Eve, but shortly he makes the inevitable choice.[122] Lyndesay's Adam is overcome by woman despite his intelligence, as, it is remarked, many men have been overcome.[123] Adam in *Psyche or Love's Mystery* is astonished and frightened, but accepts the fruit because he is unwilling to risk Eve's loss.[124]

Salandra presents an attractive scene, if the events are accepted as without universal significance, in which Eve tries to obtain reassurance of Adam's love before she admits her deed.[125] When Adam learns of her act, despite all her wiles he refuses to eat. Finally, he pretends to eat, but Eve is not amused. Eve threatens suicide, and Adams eats. The scene in Vondel is also attractive, but the playwright, like Salandra, seems to be concerned only with a domestic quarrel.[126]

Milton's Eve in her temptation of Adam is again superior to her predecessors. Skillfully and quickly she leads Adam to justify what he will do. She has sought this new happiness and this approach to equality with God for Adam's sake, she tells him, and now she would share everything with him. She closes her appeal with emphasis on their great love. As Adam recovers from his astonishment and horror, his first thought is that he cannot lose this lovely and congenial creature, not even for God and with the certainty of another woman. Eve then shrewdly says nothing while Adam offers himself the same arguments Satan had used with Eve. Now Eve speaks again, seizing on Adam's hopeless slavery to her, and magnifying their great love as the vital issue. She embraces him and weeps, and Adam is eternally lost. Against the background created by Milton's dramatic skill and power and the poetry of four great speeches Eve stands forth as magnificent in her agency of evil as she had been in her early roles in the poem.

The tradition did not expand the statements in *Genesis* that immediately after their sin Adam and Eve became aware of their nakedness and covered themselves with fig leaves. Milton's scene in which carnal desire flames hotly, Eve matches Adam in lascivious intention, and they exhaust themselves in lustful indulgence, is an original and important addition, McColley has reminded us, to the ancient belief that lust was a consequence of the Fall.[127] Baldwin mentions "a rabbinical precedent in representing the forbidden fruit as possessing the qualities of an aphrodisiac."[128] Nothing in the tradition, however, anticipates Milton's vivid illustration of the immediate manifestation of carnality. In Milton, after Adam and Eve awaken from the exhausted sleep that follows their amorous excesses, they realize their nakedness. Milton's stress on Eve's equal interest and participation in what occurred adds further to her individuality and personality. It has been suggested by Bush that this episode perhaps is reminiscent of the conduct of Helen with Paris after Aphrodite had brought him from the battle to the palace and of what happened when Hera came to the summit of Mount Ida to divert Zeus' attention from the events at Troy.[129]

The traditional treatments of what followed Eve's successful temptation of Adam vary in extensiveness and in order of events. In some versions, for illustration in the *Book of Jubilees,* [130] the *Apocalypsis Mosis,*[131] the Coventry plays,[132] Du Bartas,[133] and Andreini,[134] Adam and Eve do not quarrel before God judges them. The Caedmon poet shows a penitent Eve who is with Adam for some time before God appears.[135] In Grotius, Eve's scene with Adam occurs before the Voice summons them to judgment; Eve comforts her husband and persuades him not to destroy himself.[136] Likewise in *Adam in Ballingschap* Eve quarrels with Adam and becomes reconciled with him before Uriel appears, as God's messenger, to sentence them.[137] Milton's scene between Eve and Adam, after they recover from the exhaustion that follows their lustful orgy and before they hear the voice of God, is very brief. Eve, as in some other accounts, is quick to place the blame on Adam. At this accusation, Adam "then first incenst" denounces her severely and comments bitterly on what happens to "Him who to worth in women overtrusting/ Lets her Will

rule." Milton may have seized this opportunity to speak from his own experience, but perhaps the reader should not be too ready to believe that whenever Adam assails women Milton is settling an old score.

In the brief scene in which God pronounces sentence on Eve and Adam, Milton does not expand the characterization of Eve, nor for that matter of Adam, that is given in the same scene in *Genesis*. In fact, the most powerful line, the simple statement in which Eve stands forth momentarily dignified, mature, and strong in contrast to Adam's weak evasiveness, "The serpent me beguiled and I did eat," is taken, with one slight change in word order from the King James Version. Nearly all other writers also had followed the Old Testament scene. In Jewish legend Eve does not, like Adam, confess her sins and ask for pardon, and among other transgressions for which God punishes the Serpent is his attempt to cause Adam's death so that he can mate with Eve.[138] Du Bartas has God assail Eve before she has a chance to speak and then exhibit a sadistic determination to torture her in the expletives he hurls at her after her sentence.[139] Milton does not borrow these elaborations, however, or invent additions.

Milton demonstrates once more his sure sense of drama, organization, and characterization by placing after God's sentence the major scene of Eve and Adam's traditional quarrel and reconciliation. Thus, he portrays concisely and with powerful effectiveness the first results of the full impact of their actions and their readjustment to these circumstances and to each other. Whatever the poet intended, it is Eve's scene far more than Adam's. She is contrite, humble, heartbroken, but the restoration of her greatness is also beginning. Adam assails her with utmost viciousness. Eve's humility and generosity defeat Adam's bitterness. Her proposal of suicide, although made in disregard or ignorance of the greater issues which Adam thinks he understands, is the reaction of a realist, ready to face up to circumstances and, if necessary, to God himself. Beside the growing stature of Eve, Adam seems for a short while almost childish, but as the scene closes he again becomes worthy of her.

Most other writers, Avitus, the Caedmon poet, the author of *Cursor Mundi*, Du Bartas, Grotius, Beaumont, Pordage, and Vondel among them, are not concerned with Eve after her sentence except

to include her in the expulsion. Andreini leads Eve and Adam into an extended morality in which nothing is added to Eve's portrait. Salandra also extends the story through many scenes, stressing the grief of Adam and Eve because of the effects of their sin on mankind, but Eve's participation in this aftermath is not of any special importance.

In Books XI and XII of *Paradise Lost* Eve appears only briefly. Milton uses the occasions, however, to complete the portrait of the first of women — but human now through experience and self-regeneration. After her lament for the loss of the home she loves, she receives the Angel's consolation and benediction. When the revelation to Adam is finished, she awakens to join him, and to present her great curtain speech. Then in Milton's final separate reference to her he emphasizes her universal motherhood, and, by using the personal pronoun, he insures the crowning epithet. She has become "our Mother *Eve*."

Eve is usually considered, and rightly, as part of the gorgeous fabric of the great epic. Only when we study her alone, however, and in the light of what Milton's predecessors had achieved with her do we realize fully the magnificence of Milton's creation and understand something of the means by which it is accomplished. She stands with the greatest women in literature because of Milton's invention or sure selection of incident, his great skill in drama and dialogue, his profound insight into character, and his poetic genius.

---

[1]*The Works of John Milton,* ed. by F. A. Patterson (New York, 1931), IV, 85.

[2]Milton, XV, 163.

[3]H. F. Fletcher, *Milton's Rabbinical Readings* (Urbana, 1930), p. 171.

[4]According to the list in C. S. Osgood, *The Classical Mythology of Milton's English Poems.*

[5]Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1925), I, 68, 60.

[6]Avitus, *Poematum de Mosaicae Gestis, Libri Quinque,* in Migne's *Patrologia Latina,* LIX, 333.

[7]Charles W. Kennedy, *The Caedmon Poems* (London, 1916), pp. 22, 27.

[8]Arnold Williams, *The Common Expositor; An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527-1633* (Chapel Hill, 1948), p. 87.

[9]J. H. Hanford, *A Milton Handbook* (New York, 1946), p. 262.

[10]*The Complete Works of Joshua Sylvester,* ed. by Alexander B. Grosart (Edinburgh, 1880), I, Sixth Day of First Week, lines 1045-1053.

[11]*The Adamus Exul of Hugo Grotius,* trans. by Francis Barham (London, 1840), p. 10.

[12]Giambattista Andreini, *L'Adamo,* trans. by William Cowper, *Works* (London, 1954), VI, 347, 356.

[13]Thomas Peyton, *The Glasse of Time in the First Age* (New York, 1886), p. 61.

[14]Joseph Beaumont, *Psyche or Love's Mystery* (Cambridge, 1702), p. 82.

[15]Serafino della Salandra, *Adamo Caduto, Tragedia Sacra* (Cosenza, 1647), pp. 39-40. Photostat from Library of Harvard College.

[16]Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* (Minneapolis, 1932), p. 284; Willard Connerly, "Imprints of the *Aeneid* on *Paradise Lost,*" *Classical Journal,* XVIII (1922-23), 473.

[17]Ginzberg, I, 68.

[18]Fletcher, *Milton's Rabbinical Readings,* p. 174.

[19]*Ibid.,* p. 179.

[20]Philo, *Works,* trans. by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker (London and New York, 1929), I, 119.

[21]Avitus, p. 333.

[22]Williams, pp. 85-87.

[23]Sylvester, I, First Day of Second Week, lines 76-81.

[24]*Ibid.,* lines 281-283.

[25]Grotius, p. 13.

[26]Andreini, p. 329.

[27]Peyton, p. 61.

[28]Salandra, pp. 8, 38-43.

[29]Beaumont, pp. 82-84.

[30]Samuel Pordage, *Mundorum Eplicato,* 1661. Quoted from Watson Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle* (Toronto, 1952), p. 426.

[31]Joost van den Vondel, *Adam in Ballingschap,* in *Werken* (Amsterdam, 1820), pp. 106-110, 118-119, 127.

[32]Alwin Thaler, "The Shakespearian Element in Milton," *PMLA, XL* (1925), 691.

[33]Fletcher, *Milton's Rabbinical Readings,* p. 33.

[34]Ginzberg, I, 68.

[35]E. C. Baldwin, "Some Extra-Biblical Semitic Influences Upon Milton's Story of the Fall of Man," *JEGP,* XXVIII (1929), 366-401.

[36]Philo, I, 121.

[37]Avitus, p. 332.

[38]St. Augustine, *The City of God,* trans. by John Healey (London, 1947), II, 51.

[39]*Ibid.,* p. 57.

[40]Williams, p. 88.

[41]*Ibid.,* pp. 89-90.

[42]Grotius, pp. 19-20.

[43]Andreini, pp. 348-350.

[44]Sir David Lyndesay, *The Monarche* (London, 1865), p. 28.

[45]Beaumont, p. 84.

[46]R. H. Charles, *The Apocrapha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1913), II, 142.

[47]Ginzberg, I, 72; Baldwin, pp. 369-370.

[48]H. F. Fletcher, "Milton and Yosippon," *SP,* XXI (1924), 498.

[49]Baldwin, p. 375.

[50]Philo, I, 125.

[51]Avitus, pp. 332-333.

[52]Grant McColley, *Paradise Lost* (Chicago, 1940), p. 173.

[53]Kennedy, pp. 23-26.

[54]Kennedy, p. xli; F. N. Robinson, "A Note on the Sources of the Old Saxon *Genesis*," *MP*, IV (1906), 396-398.
[55]Sylvester, I, First Day of Second Week, lines 76-85, 281-283.
[56]Grotius, pp. 22-27.
[57]Beaumont, p. 85.
[58]Andreini, 357-358.
[59]*Adam in Ballingschap*, 126-127.
[60]Salandra, pp. 66-68.
[61]*Adam in Ballingschap*, p. 142.
[62]Avitus, p. 333.
[63]Andrew Ramsey, *Poemata Sacra*, 1633. Quoted from Kirkconnell, p. 285.
[64]Beaumont, p. 85.
[65]Pordage, quoted in *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 427.
[66]Andreini, 356-357.
[67]*Adam in Ballingschap*, pp. 143-144.
[68]Ginzberg, I, 72-73.
[69]Fletcher, "Milton and Yosippon," p. 498.
[70]Avitus, p. 333.
[71]Peyton, p. 64.
[72]Pordage, quoted in *The Celestial Cycle*, pp. 428-429.
[73]*The Poetical Works of Richard Crashaw and Quarles' Emblems*, ed. by George Gilfillan (Edinburgh, 1862), pp. 203-204.
[74]Salandra, p. 70.
[75]Charles, II, 146.
[76]Ginzberg, I, 72.
[77]Avitus, pp. 333-334.
[78]*Curso Mundi*, ed. by the Rev. Richard Morris (London, 1874-93), p. 53.
[79]*The Coventry Mysteries*, ed. by James O. Halliwell, in *A Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays* (London, 1853), p. 25.
[80]*The Chester Plays*, ed. by Thomas Wright, in *A Supplement to Dodsley's Old Plays*, ed. by Thomas Amyot *et al.* (London, 1853), p. 27.
[81]*The Plays performed by the Craft of York . . .*, ed. by Lucy Toulmin Smith (Oxford, 1885), p. 23.
[82]Grotius, pp. 31-32.
[83]Andreini, 360-363.
[84]Lyndesay, p. 31.
[85]Peyton, p. 64.
[86]*Adam in Ballingschap*, pp. 146-148.
[87]Pordage, quoted in *The Celestial Cycle*, pp. 429-430.
[88]Salandra, p. 70.
[89]Charles, II, 146.
[90]Philo, I, 124-125.
[91]Grotius, pp. 31-32.
[92]Ginzberg, I, 72.
[93]Fletcher, "Milton and Yosippon," p. 498.
[94]Grotius, p. 30.
[95]Andreini, pp. 361-363.
[96]Sylvester, I, First Day of Second Week, lines 302-333.
[97]H. F. Fletcher, *Milton's Semitic Studies* (Chicago, 1926), pp. 136-137; Fletcher, "Milton and Yosippon," pp. 498, 499.
[98]Williams, pp. 120-121.

[99]Sylvester, First Day of Second Week, lines 346-348.
[100]Grotius, pp. 28-35.
[101]Thaler, p. 656.
[102]Quarles, p. 204.
[103]Beaumont, p. 86.
[104]Salandra, pp. 70-78.
[105]Avitus, p. 334.
[106]Beaumont, p. 86.
[107]Ginzberg, I, 74.
[108]Denis Saurat, *Milton, Man and Thinker* (New York, 1925), pp. 283-284.
[109]Fletcher, "Milton and Yosippon," p. 498.
[110]Fletcher, *Milton's Rabbinical Readings,* p. 206.
[111]Williams, p. 123.
[112]Kennedy, p. 27.
[113]Sylvester, I, First Day of Second Week, lines 358-365.
[114]Salandra, pp. 86-89.
[115]Sylvester, I, First Day of Second Week, lines 358-363.
[116]Charles, I, 17.
[117]*Ibid.,* p. 146.
[118]Ginzberg, I, 74.
[119]St. Augustine, II, 42.
[120]Kennedy, pp. 25-30.
[121]Grotius, pp. 36-39.
[122]Andreini, pp. 369-372.
[123]Lyndesay, p. 32.
[124]Beaumont, pp. 86-87.
[125]Salandra, pp. 89-95.
[126]*Adam in Ballingschap,* pp. 149-154.
[127]McColley, p. 177.
[128]Baldwin, p. 376.
[129]Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* (Minneapolis, 1932), p. 278.
[130]Charles, II, 16-17.
[131]*Ibid.,* p. 147.
[132]*The Coventry Mysteries,* p. 25.
[133]Sylvester, First Day of Second Week, lines 365 ff.
[134]Andreini, pp. 365-379.
[135]Kennedy, pp. 32-35.
[136]Grotius, pp. 42-49.
[137]*Adam in Ballingschap,* pp. 159-164.
[138]Ginzberg, I, 77-78.
[139]Sylvester, First Day of Second Week, lines 434-459.

The Effects of Revision in the Beaumont and Fletcher Play, *Wit at Several Weapons*

James E. Savage

WIT AT SEVERAL WEAPONS is one of the more enjoyable comedies found in the Beaumont and Fletcher Folio of 1647. It has the lightness and deftness of dialogue of Beaumont and Fletcher's best work, without the superficial emotional intensity of the tragicomedies. In conduct of plot, and in characterization, it is perhaps most closely akin to *The Wild Goose Chase* and *Monsieur Thomas.* On these qualities is superimposed much good-natured burlesque similiar to that in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle.*

Yet in reading *Wit at Several Weapons* one is confused by many inconsistencies of dialogue and action, inconsistencies which probably are explainable in terms of revision. References to contemporary affairs abound throughout the play, usually in association with those inconsistencies. A study of the work of the reviser of this play may shed some light on the general processes of revision employed by the dramatists of the Jacobean period.

Since many of the arguments which I shall employ will suppose a fairly detailed knowledge of character and action in *Wit at Several Weapons,* it seems advisable to give a brief summary of the play itself. Wittypate, the son of Sir Perfidious Oldcraft, is about to be disinherited by his father. Sir Perfidious is old and rich. He has "rizze ungently," as "intelligencer close for wenching," and by means of the "charge of orphans," whom in childhood he "bound forth to felt-

makers." He prides himself extremely on his wit, and Wittypate must prove himself a worthy son, or the father's property will go to Credulous Oldcraft, a cousin, and a Cambridge scholar.

Wittypate demonstrates his wit most effectively. He enlists the aid of Sir Ruinous Gentry, Lady Gentry, and Priscian, and together they impose three major cheats on Sir Perfidious himself, as beggars, as robbers throwing the guilt on the Cambridge scholar Credulous, and as very expensive musicians at a wedding in which Sir Perfidious is forced to accept the wrong husband for his niece.

Meanwhile Sir Perfidious is perpetrating his "last cheat." He is guardian to a wealthy "Neece," and he proposes to wed her to Sir Gregory Fop, "Fop Gregory the First," provided he may retain two thirds of her dowry. Sir Gregory has a witty retainer, Cunningham, or "Cunningame," whom Sir Perfidious, exercising his wit, introduces to the Neece as the proposed husband. Cunningame and the Neece fall in love, and their procedures thereafter, though devious and unnecessary, produce a very entertaining plot. Cunningame pretends to make love to the Neece's "Gardinesse," who avidly accepts his attentions. The Neece in retaliation fawns on Pompey Doodle, servant to Sir Gregory Fop. Pompey takes her very seriously indeed, and forsakes his master's service. The Neece gives tokens, a scarf and a diamond, to Sir Gregory, and tells him that, while he must wear them temporarily, he merely bears them to a worthier man. Cunningame takes the tokens from Sir Gregory, telling him that he will give them to Pompey, the proper owner. Meanwhile he "uses the same fop" to carry his token, a ruby, to the Neece, by the process of saying it is for Mirabel, niece to the Gardinesse, and adjuring Sir Gregory not to show it to the Neece.

Being now in possession of the scarf, Cunningame pretends to give it to Mirabel; the Neece in anger reveals her love, and she and Cunningame plan an exercise of wit to supplant Sir Gregory Fop.

Wittypate and his helpers aid Cunningame in the last act. They convince Sir Perfidious that the Neece has run away to join Pompey Doodle, and that Sir Gregory is about to marry Lady Gentry. These things can be prevented if Sir Perfidious comes upon them unaware, "in the guise of a masque." He agrees to pay for the music. Mean-

while, by a trick, Cunningame has betrothed Sir Gregory Fop to Mirabel. While Sir Perfidious is protesting the hundred pounds he must pay for the music, Cunningame and the Neece are married by the Cambridge scholar, Credulous.

Wittypate, having proved his wit, is acknowledged as heir, Sir Ruinous and Lady Gentry are reinstated in society, Priscian is entertained as Chaplain by Sir Gregory, who has "the gift of twenty benefices," and Pompey Doodle, who is convinced the Neece has thrown herself away, is reinstated as Sir Gregory's servant. Only the Cambridge scholar, Credulous, is left without the rewards of wit.

A second preliminary step is also necessary, for in order to establish revision, it is necessary to show something to be revised. To that end I shall treat the evidence which suggests an early version of *Wit at Several Weapons,* a version falling probably between 1605 and 1608. It is the opinion of E. H. C. Oliphant that there was a version for Paul's Boys, about 1604, and a version about 1613 for the Lady Elizabeth's Men.[1] I suggest that the early version may have been as late as 1608, and that Beaumont, Fletcher, and Middleton all had a hand in it. In general, it resembles the satirical plays written for the boys' companies during the early years of the seventeenth century. In fact it contains so many things which may be interpreted as thrusts at James and his court that I suggest probable suppression by the Master of the Revels. Such a suppression would account for the fact that no records of performances, and no early quartos, exist.

That the play existed in some form early in the century is borne out by internal evidence, as well as by bits of external evidence. In this passage, to which both Oliphant and Thorndike refer, we find a playwright speaking well of the Scots, a thing which few of them were inclined to do after the very early years of the reign:

> Since, Sir, I serv'd in *France,* the *Low Countries,* lastly, at that memorable Skirmish at *Newport,* where the forward and bold *Scot* there spent his life so freely, that from every single heart that there fell, came home from his resolution a double honour to his country.[2] (6Kr; I, ii)

The passage is a part of the gulling of Sir Perfidious Oldcraft, and Sir Ruinous Gentry, in the character of a begging soldier, is the

speaker. The Battle of Newport occurred in 1600, and there would be little virtue in referring to it, except as flattery of the new king.

In a similar passage in the second act, which can probably be considered a thrust at James himself, there appears the customary attitude of the playwright towards the Scots:

Lady. So, what Saddle have I?
Pris. Mounsiuer *Laroon's* the *French-mans.*
Lady. That agen,
You know so well it is not for my stride,
How oft have I complain'd on't?
Pris. You may have *Jockey's* then, the little *Scotch* one.
(6Kv; II, i)

Oliphant suggests that the following lines are most likely to have been written in the early part of the reign of James, though the particular person who earned, and failed to receive, his knighthood is not traceable:

Neece. 'Twould ha' kill'd
A sensible man, he would ha' gone to his Chamber
And broke his heart by this time.
Sir Greg. Thank you heartily.
Neece. Or fixt a naked rapier in a wall,
Like him that earn'd his Knighthood e're he had it,
And then refus'd upon't, ran up to'th hilts.
Sir Greg. Yes, let him run for me, I was never brought up to't,
I never profest running i' my life. (6K4v; III, i)

Jonson, Chapman and Marston are probably the objects of Pompey Doodle's, and Beaumont's, wit in connection with the diamond taken from Sir Gregory Fop. It will be recalled that Drummond relates, in the *Conversations,* that "for writting something aginst the Scots in a play Eastward Hoe, . . . the report was that they should then have had their ears cutt and noses," though fortunately the threat was not carried out. That Beaumont had knowledge of this incident is strongly suggested by a passage from the Prologue to *The Woman Hater:*

For he that made this Play, meanes to please Auditors
So, as hee may bee an Auditor himselfe hereafter, and not
purchase them with the deare losse of his eares: . . . You

> *shall not find in it the ordinarie and over worne trade of ieasting at Lordes and Courtiers, and Citizens, without taxation of any particular or new vice by them found out, but at the persons of them: such, he that made this, thinkes vile, and for his owne part vowes, That hee did neuer thinke, but that a Lord borne might bee a wise man, and a Courtier an honest man.* (Q1, 1607, A2r, A2v)

Pompey Doodle, in a conversation with Cunningame in *Wit at Several Weapons,* denies receipt of the diamond, for

> 'Twould be seene
> Some where about me, you may well think that,
> I have an arme for a Scarfe, as others have,
> An Ear, to hang a Jewel too, and that's more
> Then some men have, my betters a great deale.[3] (6L3r; IV, i)

The date of *Eastward Hoe* is 1605 and Pompey Doodle's speech, if it is a thrust at Jonson and the others, should have been written not long after the imprisonment of the playwrights.[4]

In addition to this glance at *Eastward Hoe,* there may be in *Wit at Several Weapons* indebtedness to another play probably written in 1604, *Measure for Measure.* In each play there is a "Clowne," the one named Pompey Doodle, the othey Pompey Bum. The Pompey of *Wit at Several Weapons* was "Kersened" by Goodman Caesar. The Pompey of Measure for Measure is assured that Escalus "will proue a shrewd Caesar" to him, and when under arrest, is "at the wheels of Caesar." There is much talk between Pompey and Froth and the Constable Elbow of *Measure for Measure* about dishes. In *Wit at Several Weapons,* Sir Ruinous Gentry, as a "North-Brittaine Constable," will tolerate no "Dishporridgement."

The various bits of evidence, internal and external, which have just been treated should constitute a sufficient basis for assuming a version of *Wit at Several Weapons* as early as 1608. The several references to the New River, which was dedicated for the public use in 1613, should be sufficient to show that there was tampering with the original text.[5] There are, however, passages which seem to have reference to practically all the years through 1620, as will appear in my discussion of the passages I take to be revisions. I am inclined to think there

may have been two revisions, but such a fact would be hard to establish, and I shall disregard the problem. I hope, rather, to show how the interpolations affect the text of the play, and conversely, how they are to be detected, usually, by some dislocation in the text.

That there was revision about 1620 is implied in the meagre history of *Wit at Several Weapons,* as will appear from a brief summary of the external evidence. The only early texts of the play are in the folios of 1647 and 1679, the latter apparently derived from the former. Aside from the fact of inclusion in the folios, the only contemporary indication of authorship lies in a prologue, written after Fletcher's death, which indicates that Fletcher "writ An Act, or two." The prologue itself is for "the reviving of this Play," and contains a statement that "Twas well receiv'd before." Fletcher is also given partial credit for the authorship in the prologue to Colley Cibber's *The Rival Fools:*

> FROM *sprightly* Fletcher's *loose Confed'rate Muse*
> *Th' unfinish'd Hints of these light Scenes we chuse,*
> *For with such careless haste his Play was writ,*
> *So unperus'd each thought of started wit;*
> *Each Wepon of his Wit so lamely sought,*
> *That 'twou'd as scanty on our Stage be thought,*
> *As for a modern* Belle *my Grannum's Peticoat.*[6]

An additional bit of contemporary evidence about *Wit at Several Weapons* needs to be noted. Frank Marcham, in his *King's Office of the Revels,* reproduces some scraps of paper, presumably to be accounted for as waste matter in the office of Sir George Buc, which contain the names of plays. They are, it is likely, plays proposed for court performance. The presence of *Wit at Several Weapons* on one of these lists suggests an early version, belonging to one of the boys' companies;[7] presence about 1620 in the repertory of Prince Charles's Men; and probable revision about 1620 with a view to Court performance.

It is not my purpose in this paper to explore these questions of company, authorship, and date, though some incidental comments on them may arise. It is rather my plan to set forth some of the items of internal evidence which confirm the implications of the external evi-

dence that there was revision, and to show some of the consequences of the work of the reviser. The usual evidences of revision are all present: repetitions of material, improper or missing speech-prefixes, inconsistencies in the action. But the work of the reviser is here more far reaching and more obvious than is usual. The process of revision is a simple one normally, the mere insertion of rather obvious references to events almost contemporaneous with the time of revision.

The by-products of these revisions are numerous: irregularities in the meter; shifts from prose to verse, or verse to prose; completely irrelevant speeches; notable inconsistencies in character or action. Some dislocation of the sort indicated almost invariably accompanies any obvious insertion of a contemporary reference, and the reader soon comes to feel that any peculiarity in the text may be the result of revision.

In discussing the workings in *Wit at Several Weapons* of the revisions, it is probably best to start with metrical considerations. Though some of the scenes are clearly intended for prose, the larger part of the play is written in the standard dramatic verse of the period. There are, however, many passages even in the verse which cannot be scanned. Such a passage as the following will illustrate my point, and serve as an introduction to the later discussion:

> They put things call'd Executorships upon me
> The charge of Orphans, little sencelesse creatures,
> Whom in their Childe-hoods I bound forth to Feltmakers,
> To make 'em lose and work away their Gentry,
> Disguise their tender natures with hard customs,
> So wrought 'em out in time, there I rizze ungently,
> Nor do I feare to discourse this unto thee,
> I'me arm'd at all points against treachery,
> I hold my humor firme, if I can see thee thrive by
> Thy wits while I live, I shall have the more courage
> To trust thee with my Lands when I dye; if not
> The next best wit I can heare of carries 'em:
> For since in my time and knowledge so many rich Children
> Of the City conclude in beggery, i'de rather
> Make a wise stranger my Executor, then a foolish

> Sonne my Heire, and to have my Lands call'd after my
> Wit, thou after my name; and that's my nature. (6I3r; I, i)

It is my suggestion that the "Feltmakers" and the "rich Children of the City" are interpolations, though I can propose no specific references. At any rate, after some hundred or so conventional lines, the latter part of this passage comes as something of a surprise. It should be noted that, as the metrical structure degenerates, the individual line is very likely to receive an extra stress.[8]

This long line is the feature of the revisions upon which I wish to dwell next. There are many places in which a line stands out noticeably from its neighbors because of its unusual length. The following are neat samples:

> Which Gentlewoman new divorc'st, which Trades-man
> breaking (6I3r: I, i)

> But 'twill make shift to bury me, by day-light too, (6I3v; I, i)
> Perhaps had she been seen, you had never seen her,

> There's many a spent-thing call'd an't like your honour,
> That lyes in wait for her at first snap, she's a Countesse,
> Drawne with sixe Mares through Fleete-streete, and a
> Coach-man,
> Sitting Bare-headed to their *Flaundres buttocks* (6I3r; I, i)

It is certainly a fact that Fletcher, and many of the other Jacobean playwrights, frequently wrote lines with too many stresses. But they do not normally, as do those just quoted and many others in *Wit at Several Weapons,* mark passages where there is a strong presumption that the text has been revised. Having made the point that this overburdened line is frequently both a product and a sign of revision, I must, obviously, show why I believe revision occurred at certain points, and point out whatever effect it has on the text.

The first of these lines just quoted, "Which Gentlewoman new divorc'st, which Trades-man breaking," is rather obviously designed to call into the minds of the audience fairly recent events. Two divorces stand out in the early Jacobean period, those of the Lady Rich (Sidney's Penelope Devereaux), and Frances, the daughter of Henry Howard, Earl of Suffolk, who divorced the Earl of Essex in order to marry Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset. Because of the juxta-

position with the other phrase, "tradesman breaking," I believe the reference is probably to the Essex divorce, which occurred in 1613. The misfortunes of two tradesmen are prominent enough before 1620 to be noted in such records as the Chamberlain letters and the *CSPD*. John Chamberlain tells us that Arthur Ingram, whom he calls "the great undertaker," has broken for large sums.[9] This was in 1611. And in 1617, the credit of Alderman Cockayne was seriously threatened by the breaking of two commercial houses in Germany.[10] That one or another of these events is glanced at seems likely, and if so, the peculiar line is the product of revision.

That the second of the passages is an interpolation seems likely in view of the implications of the phrase, "by day-light too." The origin of night burial is probably suggested by this passage from Arthur Wilson:

> And now the King casts his thoughts towards *Peterborough,* where his Mother lay, whom he caused to be translated to a Magnificent Tomb, at *Westminster.* And (somewhat suitable to her mind when she was living) she had a translucent passage in the night, through the City of *London,* by multitudes of Torches: The Tapers placed by the Tomb and the Alter, in the *Cathedral,* smoaking with them like an *Offertory,* with all the *Ceremonies,* and *Voices,* their *Quires* and *Copes* could express, attended by many Prelates and Nobles.[11]

The date given by Wilson is 1612. That the practice became common thereafter is noted by John Chamberlain in his letter to Carleton on 19 December, 1618:

> The Lord Haye or Doncaster buried his younge sonne at St. Clements this weeke, by night, yet with some solemnitie. . . .
>
> Yt is growne altogether in fashion to burie now by night, as on Sonday last the Lady Haddington had a solemne convoy of almost an hundred coaches (and torches in abundance), that accompanied her from Westminster to White-chappell on her way to New-Hall in Essex where she is to be buried.[12]

The third of those passages quoted above, in which the irregular line appears, contains material also which, in all probability, is inter-

polated. The specific reference this time is to the phrase "drawne with sixe mares." The historian Arthur Wilson is again my source:

> The stout old Earl Northumberland, when he was got loose, hearing that the great Favourite, *Buckingham,* was drawn about with a Coach and six Horses (which was wondred at then as a *novelty,* and imputed to him as a *mastring pride*), thought if *Buckingham* had six, he might very well have eight in his Coach, with which he rode through the City of *London* to the *Bath,* to the vulgar talk and admiration: . . . . Nor did this addition of two Horses by *Buckingham* grow higher than a little *murmur.* For in the late Queen's time, there were no Coaches, and the first had but two Horses, the rest crept in by *Degrees.*[13]

Northumberland was released from the Tower in 1621, though Buckingham had presumably been using six horses somewhat earlier.[14]

The effect of the interpolations on the metrical structure of the play has been taken up first, for it will be in evidence to some extent in connection with passages quoted in order to make entirely different points. One or two of these can be brought out by some discussion of the characterization. Sir Gregory Fop is a most interesting character, the ancestor, I suspect, of the notable fops of the Restoration. Sir Perfidious in a single scene, calls him these names, which are presumably synonyms: coxcomb, Fop, fool, Gregory and dolt. Cunningame calls him "*Fop Gregory* the First." He is a "lad of thousands," "Fop of *Fop-Hall,*" the "*antient, st* [*sic*] *Fop in England,*" one "borne to Lordships." He says of himself that his mistress would have "a little Souldier" and "some Schollar" in him, that he "never profest running" in his life, and that he was "never double-tongu'd."

His physical appearance is to be gleaned largely from the speeches of the other characters. He is a "thinne" gentleman, with "small trapstick leggs;" the Neece, admiring Pompey Doodle's beard, asks, "When will the Knight thy Master have such a Stampe of man-hood on his face;" his fingers are "leane mattrice rubbers."

These items of description are taken from various parts of the play, and represent fairly the Sir Gregory Fop of the original version. One is tempted to see a resemblance to James I. Such a representation

of James could not come on the stage, certainly; but I suspect that the very resemblance is the reason that there is no record of performance of *Wit at Several Weapons*. This portrait should, perhaps, be compared with that of James given by Sir Anthony Weldon:

> He was of a middle stature, more corpulent through his cloathes then in his body, yet fat enough, his cloathes ever being made large and easie, the Doublets quilted for steletto proof, his Breeches in plates, and full stuffed: He was naturally of a timorous disposition, which was the reason of his quilted doublets, his eyes large, ever rolling after any stranger came in his presence . . . his Beard was very thin; his tongue too large for his mouth; . . . his skin was as soft as Taffeta Sarsnet, which felt so, because he never washt his hands . . . his legs were very weak, having as was thought some foul play in his youth . . . he naturally loved not the sight of a Soldier, nor of any valiant man.[15]

At only one point in the play is this concept of the character and appearance of Sir Gregory abandoned:

> Say he be black, hee's of a very good pitch,
> Well anckled, two good confident calves, they looke
> As if they would not shrink at the ninth childe;
> The rednesse ith' face, why that's in fashion,
> Most of your high bloods have it, signe of greatnesse marry;
> 'Tis to be taken downe too with May butter,
> Ile send to my *Lady Spendtayle* for her Medicine, (6I4r; I, i)

In this passage Sir Gregory changes character and description: he is more like Robert Carr than like James. "Greatnesse" would be applicable to a favorite; the pun on "pitch" has meaning only if that word is taken as "height" or "degree." Robert Carr, as Earl of Somerset, was convicted in May ("May butter") of complicity in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury; and "my Lady Spend-tayle" may well be Mrs. Turner, who provided the medicine that was supposed to have made Essex impotent, and to have poisoned Overbury.

Many of the elements in this line of argument are speculative; but Sir Gregory does, in the passage quoted, become temporarily quite a different person. Revision of some sort, whether or not it involves James and Somerset, is surely the reason. The character of Sir

Gregory has suffered in clarity and consistency because of the work of the reviser. It could, I think, be shown that the characters of Sir Perfidious and Lady Gentry suffer in the same way. It should be noted that in this passage, as in the earlier ones quoted, the verse becomes rough, and the long line appears—"Most of your high bloods have it, signs of greatnesse, marry."

Still a different effect of the revision is what may be called irrelevant speeches—responses which are obviously not the logical consequences of the speeches just preceding. It is difficult to explain them without fairly elaborate analyses, but I shall point out two which involve Sir Gregory Fop, and one in which Pompey Doodle is concerned.

In the first act, Cunningame, merely for an exercise of "wit," is to be presented to the Neece as the proposed suitor, in place of the real candidate, Sir Gregory. These lines set up the situation:

O. K. Sir Perfidious
You shall not be seene yet, wee'le stale your friend first,
If't please but him to stand for the Anti-maske.
Sir Greg. Puh, he shall stand for any thing, why his supper
Lyes i' my breeches here, ile make him fast else.
O. K. Then come you forth more unexpectedly
The Maske itself, a thousand a yeare joynture,
The cloud your friend will be then drawne away,
And only you the beauty of the play.
Sir Greg. For Red and Black Ile put downe all your Fullers,
Let but your Neece bring White, and we have three Cullours.
(6I3v; I, i)

Sir Gregory's couplet does not appear to be a sensible response to the statement of the Old Knight. It may possibly be related to the talk about masques and anti-masques; it is more likely, however, to be related to the passage quoted on the previous page, in which the redness and blackness of Sir Gregory's appearance were noted. Even if that is so, the "White" of the Neece is not explained. Whatever the meaning of the speech, its value lies in the immediate effect on the audience, and not in the orderly conduct of the action.

The second of the irrelevant passages which I wish to discuss

involves also a cryptic speech by Sir Gregory. He has prepared a serenade for the Neece, and until the arrival of the music, he and Sir Perfidious talk beneath the Neece's window about the deplorable fact that Sir Gregory came to London with a maidenhead. Then,

Enter Page

Sir Greg. What, are they come?
Page. And plac'd directly, Sir,
Under her window.
Sir Greg. What may I call you Gentleman?
Boy. A poore servant to the Violl, I'me the Voyce, Sir.
Sir Greg. In good time Master *Voyce.*
Boy. Indeed good time doe's get the mastery.
Sir Greg. What Countryman Master Voyce?
Boy. Sir, borne at *Ely,* we all set up in *Ely,*
But our house commonly breakes in *Rutland* Shire.
Sir Greg. A shrewd place by my faith, it may well break
your voyce,
It breaks many a mans back; come, set to your businesse.
Song (6K3v, 6K4r; III, i)

The revision here is clearly marked, I believe, by the shift in speech-prefixes from "Page" to "Boy." The discussion from that point to "come, set to your businesse" is in no way connected with the action. The puns, on the breaking of a boy's voice, and on the verb "rut," are obvious (cf. Rutillio, who is employed in the "male stews" in *The Custom of the Country.*) These things are, however, of less significance than the Ely-Rutlandshire thrust. The allusion is probably irrecoverable. The best guess is that it somehow glances at the fact that Buckingham was contemplating marriage with a Roman Catholic, the daughter of the Earl of Rutland, and that at about the same time the Spanish ambassador, Count Gondomar, was being domiciled by James in Ely House, once a Bishop's palace. These are events of about 1620. At any rate, they constitute a deliberate departure from the established pattern in order to introduce a thrust at court matters. And again in these two passages, as in the earlier ones, the awkward verse and the long line appear.

Still a third item, somewhat different in nature, is Pompey Doodle's adventure with the New River. Pompey himself is a char-

acter worth meeting, the work, possibly, of Beaumont. He is capable of the same unintentional satire, and is subject to the same unjustified self-esteem, as the Citizen and his Wife in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle.* He calls himself Pompey, though his real name is Pumpey, for he was so "kersened" by Goodman Caesar, a pumpmaker. It is not unlikely that he was inspired by Pompey Bum, of *Measure for Measure,* and so belongs in the earliest version of *Wit at Several Weapons.* In the early part of the play he is courted by the Neece, as a parallel section to the courting of the Gardinesse by Cunningame, and is dismissed with the assurance that he will be "sent for." He gives up his service with Sir Gregory, and engages in "solemne walks, 'twixt *Paddington* and *Pancridge,*" waiting to be sent for. He endures much of cold and hunger, but he is faithful. Meeting Cunningame, and disturbed because no messages have come, he takes what precautions are possible:

> If you chance to meet a Footman by the way, in orange tawny ribbands, running before an empty Coach, with a Buzzard i'th Poope on't, direct him and his horses toward the new River by Islington, there they shall have me looking upon the Pipes, and whistling. (6L3r; IV, i)

The action implied in the passage just given is relevant enough, but both the New River and the coach are entirely new business for the play, and are introduced presumably for their value as contemporary references. The New River will receive further attention, but the coach will not appear again. It is a fairly good guess that it was the coach of James, Lord Hay, and that events of 1615 are referred to.[16]

Pompey Doodle, at this point, apparently gives up his solemn walks between Paddington and Pancridge, and waits by the New River to be sent for. The New River was a canal, designed to bring water to London, undertaken in 1609 by the wealthy Sir Hugh Middleton. After he had bankrupted himself, he received assistance from James I and completed the work in 1613.[17] In a public ceremony, most notable because of a pageant written by Thomas Middleton,[18] the dramatist, it was formally placed in operation.

Pompey Doodle, however, in entertaining but completely irrelevant dialogue, predicts that "twill ne're be a true water." After having

been "seven mile in length" along it, he has "seene a hundred stickle bags"; he suspects that "there's gudgeons too"; and finally, he has "told a thousand Millers thumbs in it." The stickleback is a worthless little fish, also called "miller's thumb." A gudgeon is also a small fish, and the word "gudgeon" has approximately the double meaning of our word "sucker." "Miller's thumb" has of course the traditional one of dishonesty, the one given it by Chaucer in the *Prologue*, "he hadde a thomb of gold, pardee."[19]

Still a different effect of the revisions from that which I have just discussed as irrelevancy in the dialogue is the change in detail of the action in the "Broad brim'd hat of the last progresse block, with the young hat-band, Made for a sucking Devil of two yeare old"; and the changes in the action have to do with the adventures of the Neece's scarf.

The broad-brimmed hat needs some notice, since it was, briefly, the object of attention in very high quarters. In her *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*,[20] Miss Linthicum indicates that the broad-brimmed hat came into use in England about 1620, and that it was imported from France. The first notice of it I have found in English writings is, as might be expected, in the *Letters* of John Chamberlain:

> Yesterday the Bishop of London called together all his Clergie about this towne, and told them he had expresse Commaundment from the King to will them to inveigh vehemently and bitterly in theyre sermons against the insolencie of our women, and theyre wearing of brode brimd hats, pointed dublets, theyre haire cut short or shorne, and some of them stillettaes or poinards, and such other trinckets of like moment, adding withall that yf pulpit admonitions will not reforme them he wold proceed by another course, the truth is the world is very far out of order, but whether this will mend yt God knowes.[21]

The clergy apparently heeded the King's instructions, and indeed some who were not clergy, for in his next letter, of 12 February, 1620, Chamberlain reports:

> Our pulpits ring continually of the insolence and impudence of women: and to helpe the matter forward the players have

> likewise taken them to taske, and so the ballades and ballad-singers, so that they can come no where but theyre eares tingle: and yf all this will not serve the King threatens to fall upon theyre husbands, parents or frends that have or shold have power over them and make them pay for yt.

Though those passages are sufficient for my purpose, I offer one more, which indicates that the King and the Bishop were not altogether successful in their crusade:

> The Deane of Westminster hath ben very strict in his church against Ladies and gentlewomen about yellow ruffes and wold not suffer them to be admitted into any pew, which beeing yll taken and the King moved in yt, he is come to disadvowe him, and sayes his meaning was not for yellow ruffes but for other man-like and unseemly apparell.[22]

The reviser of *Wit at Several Weapons* is not particularly in sympathy with King James and the Bishop of London, but he sees in the hats timely material for his "players." Only two people wear them, Mirabel and Sir Gregory Fop. Of Sir Gregory, wearing one, Cunningame says "I know the Magget by his head," and the Neece, believing she sees Mirabel wearing one, exclaims "Oh that whores hat a' thine, a' the riding block, A shade for lecherous kisses."

At their first introduction the hats produce a slight dislocation: Cunningame says "I am so haunted with this broad brim'd hat . . . I know not where to turne my selfe." Mirabel, wearing it, says merely "Sir?" and Cunningame adds "More Torture?" These two characters have not been together at any previous time in the play, nor has Cunningame been in the presence of anyone wearing the hat. It is possible that in the course of the revision a scene has dropped out. But it is more likely that the discrepancy is introduced as a part of an emphatic initial statement about the hats.

Greater discrepancies, caused by the hats, appear in connection with the Neece's scarf. We first meet the scarf when Sir Gregory says to the Neece, "Lady, your Scarfe's falne downe." In the presence of her Uncle, she tells Sir Gregory "You may weare it, and you please"; with her Uncle gone, however, her true motives appear:

"Would it might rot thy arme off . . . 'tis but cast Upon thee, purposely to serve another . . . sure you carry't to a worthier man." Cunningame, when he hears the story, says the scarf is meant for Pompey Doodle, who "beares a bloody minde." Cunningame, in order to learn whether the scarf was meant for himself, resolves to place it "On some new Mistris, only for a try." The "new Mistris" is of course Mirabel—"Pray weare this scarfe about you." The implication of the lines is clearly that the scarf passes into her possession. The following scene begins with this unusual stage direction:

> *Enter Cunningame (in discourse with a Mask't Gentlewoman in a broad hat and scarf'd.) Neece at another doore.*

The masquerade has the desired effect. The Neece vents her anger principally on the "whore's hat," the "shade for lecherous kisses"; in the process reveals her love for Cunningame, but only after she has discovered that not Mirabel, but a dummy, made of "fine clothes," and a broad-brimmed hat, wears the scarf. That the scarf has been in the possession of Mirabel is in no way accounted for. The addition of the broad-brimmed hats has completely changed the structure of one of the most important scenes.

The reviser of *Wit at Several Weapons* was clearly not striving to improve the play, as a Jonson or a Daniel would have done. He was, rather, making it timely. That he succeeded is evidenced by the fact that there was a production soon after the death of Fletcher. To obtain this timeliness, however, he did violence to verse, to dialogue, and to action. Perhaps the best commentary on his work is that implied in Colley Cibber's revision. Cibber retained much of the original language of *Wit at Several Weapons;* he dropped all of those lines which in this paper have been suggested as references to contemporary events; and he succeeded in clarifying many of the confusions which resulted from the work of the reviser.

In the course of this paper, I have perhaps thrown a little light on the external history of the play: the company was probably Paul's Boys, and later, the Prince's Men; the early version, of about 1608, was perhaps a collaborative effort of Fletcher, Beaumont and Middleton; the revision of about 1620 may have been the work of Rowley.

These things, however, have been incidental; my principal purpose has been to show how the revisions were accomplished, and what effect they had on the text. Two items stand out as having usefulness for other studies of revision, the line of unusual length, and the speech which is completely irrelevant as a response to preceding speeches.

[1]*The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), p. 453. The existing scholarship on the play is well summarized by Mr. Oliphant, who sees the work of Beaumont, Fletcher, Middleton and possibly Rowley in it.

[2]The Folio of 1647 will be used as the source for quotations from *Wit at Several Weapons*. Since there is in the Folio no division by scenes, I shall, for added convenience, give that used in the Dyce edition. The texts used for all citations in this paper are those in the Henry E. Huntington Library. The paper itself was made possible by a grant-in-aid from the Trustees of that library.

[3]The fourth line of this quotation, "An Ear, to hang a Jewel too," is taken from the second folio, 1679. The reading of the folio of 1647 is "And dare to hang a Jewell too," obviously incorrect in the light of the line which follows.

[4]A similar reference to the cropping of ears occurs in John Day's *Ile of Guls* (The Children of the Revels, 1606), E2v.

[5]For further discussion of the New River, cf. pp. 44-46 following.

[6]In this statement Cibber is hardly just to Fletcher, and is certainly not honest about his own achievement. He uses the plot of *Wit at Several Weapons* almost without alteration, and he uses much of the original language. He does, however, clear up several of the things which I shall point out as discrepancies, and he omits many passages which refer to contemporary events.

[7]These are the plays on the list: "Witt at" (taken by E. K. Chambers, *RES,* I (1925), 482 to be *Wit at Several Weapons*), "the Bridegr," "An ould lawe," "Henrye the vna," "A ffaire Quarrell," "All's Lost by Lust," "the Cittye," "the House is Haunte," "Looke to the Ladye," "Titus, and Vespation," "A Turkes to good for hi," "the scilent Woman," "the Dutch Curtizan," "D'Ambois," "A Woeman's A wethercock." Of these, six can not be certainly identified; two, Middleton and Rowley's "A ffaire Quarrell" certainly, and Rowley's "All's Lost for Lust" probably, belonged to the Prince's Company about 1620. The remainder of those traceable were early in the century the property of either Paul's Boys or the Queen's Revels Company.

[8]The careless, unrhythmic verse of this passage is very much like that in the plays of William Rowley. If *Wit at Several Weapons* was, as is implied by its inclusion in the list reported by Marcham (cf. n. 7), proposed for performance at Court about 1620, and was the property of the Prince's Men, Rowley is the man one would expect to be the reviser.

[9]Norman Egbert McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (Philadelphia, 1939), I, 316.

[10]Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic,* 1611-1618, p. 427.

[11]*The History of Great Britain* (London, 1653), p. 61.

[12]McClure, II, 195.

[13]Wilson, p. 130.

[14]The three items just quoted are perhaps sufficient to establish the fact that *Wit at Several Weapons* was revised about 1620. It might be well, however, to point

out other evidences of such a reworking. Lady Gentry, in disguise as a young gallant, pretends to be robbed of a diamond, "the sparking witnesse of a Contract 'Twixt a great Lawyer's daughter and my selfe." This is probably a reference to the mass of controversy surrounding the marriage between John Villiers, Buckingham's brother, and the daughter of Sir Edward Coke. Another passage not easily explainable is that in which Cunningame says, speaking to the Neece, and about the Gardinesse, "Away fifteene, Here's fifty one exceeds thee." The year 1618 was the fifteenth year of James's reign in England, and the fifty-first of his reign in Scotland. Still another element of contemporary allusion has to do with "broad brim'd hats." They appeared first in England about 1619, and caused notable comment. I shall deal with them in another context.

[15]*The Court and Character of King James* (London, 1817), pp. 55, 56.

[16]Beaumont has a poem "To Mr. B:J:" (Ben Jonson), in which he pokes fun at "white and Orrenge tawney." Arthur Wilson (pp. 92, 93), and Chamberlain (II, 13) comment satirically on Hay's finery. E. K. Chambers (*William Shakespeare,* II, 223) dates Beaumont's poem 1615 on the basis of these references. It is largely on the basis of this, and the passage relating to the New River, that the possibility of revision about 1615 arises.

[17]For an account of the New River, see George Thornbury, *Old and New London* (London, 1873-85), II, 266, 267.

[18]"The Entertainment at the Opening of the New River," *The Works of Thomas Middleton,* ed. A. H. Bullen (London, 1885), VII, 263-266.

[19]These definitions come from Nares *Glossary* and from *NED.* In fact, *NED* illustrates the meaning of stickleback by reference to this passage in *Wit at Several Weapons.*

[20]M. Channing Linthicum, *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Oxford, 1936), pp. 219-222.

[21]McClure, II, 286, 287. The broad-brimmed hats are also attacked viciously by the writer of the anonymous *Hic Mulier: or the Man-Woman,* 1620.

[22]McClure, p. 294.

Some Facts about the Theory of Fictions

Harry M. Campbell

One of the most influential ideas in the modern world has been the theory of fictions, which received its fullest treatment in the book entitled *The Philosophy of 'As If'* (by the German philosopher Hans Vaihinger), written around 1875 but not published until 1911. This book was so successful on the Continent that Vaihinger in 1919, in collaboration with Dr. Raymond Schmidt, founded a magazine, *Annalen der Philosophie* ("with particular reference to the problems of the 'As if' approach"), contributors to which included "not only professional philosophers (Cornelius, Groos, Becher, Bergman, Koffka, Kowaleski) but also eminent representatives of the most important branches of science, the theologian Heim, the lawyer Kruchman, the doctor Abderhalden, the mathematician Pasch, the physicist Volkman, the biological botanist Hansen, the economist Pohle, and the art-historian Lange."[1] The fame of Vaihinger's work quickly spread to England, where his book was translated into English by C. K. Ogden and published in 1924 in the International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, and Scientific Method, of which Ogden was general editor. Ogden hailed the book as "monumental"[2] and later (in his introduction to Jeremy Bentham's earlier book on the same subject, which he reprinted in the International Library in 1932) added that "Today a Philosophy of As-if dominates scientific thought."[3] The fame of Vaihinger's work had become world wide so

that, although *The Philosophy of 'As If'* is written in a rather technical and (for the most part) dry style, a second edition (English) appeared in 1935 and a reprinting in 1949. That Vaihinger's tremendous influence was not limited to scientific thought but had permeated all aspects of modern philosophy was attested by Etienne Gilson, who, in his book *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (1952), said:

> For what is now called philosophy is either collective mental slavery or scepticism. There still are men who hate both, and will not lament the passing of that alternative. But it will not pass away so long as the title of Vaihinger's book remains the program of our philosophical teaching: *The Philosophy of the As If, being a system of the theoretical, practical and religious fictions of mankind, on the basis of an idealistic philosophy.* . . . The time of the 'As ifs' is over; what we now need is a 'This is so,' and we shall not find it, unless we first recover both our lost confidence in the rational validity of metaphysics and our long-forgotten knowledge of its object.[4]

Jeremy Bentham's book entitled *Chrestomathia or Theory of Fictions*,[5] published in 1815, is still in several ways superior to Vaihinger's, but since Bentham's work has for the most part been either ignored or dismissed (as Ogden says in his introduction to the edition referred to above), "with contemptuous reference," and since Vaihinger's work has had such a great influence on modern thought, it seems appropriate to reconsider Vaihinger to try to understand the reason for the great appeal of his system.

In the beginning, it may be noted that Vaihinger, while claiming to be most carefully scientific in his approach, assures the reader that both biological and spiritual benefits may be derived from the planned use in one's life of fictions, which he carefully defines as "hypotheses which are known to be false, but which are employed because of their utility" (HV, p. xliii). Biologically, thought, when used in this fashion, acts "as a means in the service of the Will to Live and dominate" (HV, p. xlvi). But this is only the beginning, from which mighty spiritual benefits will eventually flow. "Thus, before our very eyes does a small psychical artifice not only develop into a mighty

source of the whole theoretical explanation of the world—for all categories arise from it—but it also becomes the origin of all the idealistic belief and behaviour of mankind" (HV, p. 49). Surely, such a wonder-working device deserves our most careful consideration, even if we may be inclined to decide that the promises made here are almost as hard to believe as the miracles and paradoxes of religious orthodoxy. Of course, from one standpoint, we are assured that we need not believe anything. Vaihinger is a positivist, he tells us, believing that "we must accept as actually real only certain sequences of sensation" (HV, p. 68) and that "the psyche must be regarded as a machine," which "works according to psycho-mechanical and psycho-chemical laws . . ." (HV, p. 101). All the rest is a process of fictions, but, somewhat paradoxically to say the least, we must *believe* in the amazing efficacy of these fictions.

And then, when we begin to examine Vaihinger's system in detail, we encounter a startling number of paradoxes which, even under the most sympathetic inspection, prove to be dangerously like ordinary contradictions. This disappointing tendency is apparent from the beginning in his unqualified definition of fictions as "hypotheses which are known to be false, but which are employed because of their utility" (HV, p. xliii), *utility*, as he makes clear on the same page, in the sense of ethical value. This is in his Introduction, but a little further on he tells us that fictions are useful only so long as they are not known to be false. "We must accept as actually real only certain sequences of sensation, from which there arise, in accordance with definite laws, structures that are treated as fictions" (HV, p. 68). He refers here to "fictitious constructs" like space, matter, etc., which "arise out of elementary sensations" and which as "products of the psyche must also be regarded as fictions created by the logical impulse in order to attain its goal," but "as soon as the mechanism by means of which these concepts perform such efficacious service is disclosed, the illusion of their truth disappears" (HV, p. 69), and they should be discarded. Here the fictions seem to be created by a benevolent, though mechanical, device of nature to protect us from shock until we are emotionally mature enough to dispense with "the illusion of their truth."

But a problem arises from the relation between his original definition of fictions as consciously false assumptions and his further statement that we cannot know the world of reality, since "we must accept as actually real only certain sequences of sensation" (HV, p. 68). "Many thought processes," he says, "appear to be consciously false assumptions, which either contradict reality or are even contradictory in themselves, but which are intentionally transformed in order to overcome difficulties of thought by this artificial deviation" (HV, pp. xvli-xlvii). But if Vaihinger cannot know objective reality, how can he know when it is contradicted? How can he know, in other words, whether our thought processes may not, to some extent at least, reflect reality? For example, why does Vaihinger include as one of his "consciously false assumptions" the belief in a God? "It is a satisfying Fiction," he says, "for many to regard the world as if a more perfect Higher Spirit had created or at least regulated it" (HV, p. xlvii). Not even Bertrand Russell's atheism is this dogmatic; Russell admits the possibility, though not the probability, that there is a God. It would have seemed more logical for Vaihinger, like Kant, to refer to God as an hypothesis, except for the fact that Vaihinger considers an hypothesis as an assumption the truth of which can be proved by further experience. At least, in view of the almost universal belief in the existence of a Supreme Being, Vaihinger would have seemed less narrowly dogmatic if he had considered God as what Bentham, in his *Theory of Fictions*, called an "inferential entity." Bentham of course was a skeptic, but he was not willing to call God a fictitious entity since the existence of such an entity could be scientifically no more disproved than proved. Bentham defined an inferential entity as one "which is not made known to human beings in general, by the testimony of sense, but of the existence of which the persuasion is produced by reflection—is inferred from a chain of reasoning."[6] Bentham also put in this category the soul considered as existing in a state of separation from the body.

Vaihinger, as might be expected, runs into logical difficulty on the problem of freedom. He says that "the idea of freedom is one of the most important concepts ever formed by man," though it is a fiction since such an idea "contradicts observation which shows that every-

thing obeys unalterable laws" (HV, p. 43). Freedom, then, is a fiction but an important one: "In the course of their development, men have formed this important construct from immanent necessity, because only on this basis is a high degree of culture and morality possible" (HV, p. 43). We act as if there were freedom when there really is none, and on this basis we develop a high system of morality, but Vaihinger should not use the word *morality* here since it usually indicates free will or responsibility for one's actions which he denies. But he says the fiction is useful, for example, in criminal law, "For if there is to be punishment there must also be guilt, but this cannot exist where responsibility and freedom are denied" (HV, p. 45). But Vaihinger's insistence that the idea of punishment must be maintained for the protection of society seems rather cruel, because society could be protected also by treating the criminal as if he were merely ill, as many modern criminologists now advocate. Vaihinger's fallacious attempt to claim Kant as an ally will be treated in detail later, but is mentioned here to show another basic contradiction, which is really Vaihinger's and not Kant's. "Thus, according to Kant," says Vaihinger, "man is not merely to be judged in his conduct *as if* he were a free agent, but should conduct himself *as if*, at some time or other, he were to be held accountable for his acts" (HV, p. 47). The word *should* here indicates obligation which may or may not be fulfilled and contradictorily indicates even in this deterministic statement that man is, to some extent at least, a free agent.

The same kind of contradiction appears in Vaihinger's account of our psyche. "The psyche," he says, "must therefore be regarded as a machine, not only because it works according to psycho-mechanical and psycho-chemical laws, but in the sense that its natural forces are intensified by these mechanical processes" (HV, p. 101). In other words he is here a pure determinist, but on the same page he says that just as "man is continually perfecting his machines," so "the psyche is always perfecting its mechanisms. . . . Thus the psyche is a machine which is continually improving itself . . ." (HV, p. 101). There is certainly confusion here. To say that the psyche improves itself would seem to give it a certain amount of initiative which it could not have if it were actuated only by "psycho-mechanical and psycho-

chemical laws." We might reconcile this contradiction in part by assuming that the mechanical processes, derived from what Vaihinger calls elsewhere "immanent necessity" (a kind of beneficent *elan vital*), operate on the psyche to improve its efficiency, but on the next page this partial reconciliation is made impossible when Vaihinger says that "The proper task of methodology is to teach us to manipulate this instrument, this thought-machine" (HV, p. 102). Freedom, he maintains, is a fiction, and yet somebody (presumably Vaihinger) can work out a methodology from which we can learn "to manipulate this instrument, this thought-machine." There are three instances of freedom here: (1) "our" teacher of methodology, who may or may not work out this methodology; (2) "we," who may or may not elect to learn it and who (3) may or may not elect to use our knowledge and power after we receive it. But if we do manipulate this "thought-machine," we will be using a great amount of freedom.

Vaihinger contradicts himself even about contradictions. On one page he says, "The main result of our investigation is, then, that *contradiction* is the driving force of thought and that without it thought could not attain its goal at all . . . what we generally call truth . . . *is merely the most expedient error.* . . . So-called agreement with reality must finally be abandoned as a criterion" (HV, p. 108). But on the very next page he says:

> All departures from reality and all self-contradictions are logical errors of the first degree . . . these errors must be cancelled, because otherwise the fictions would be valueless and harmful. . . . If, in fictions, thought contradicts reality, or even if it contradicts itself, and if in spite of this questionable procedure it nevertheless succeeds in corresponding to reality, then this deviation must have been corrected and the contradiction must have been made good. (HV, p. 109).

Thought must correspond to reality, he says here, but on the previous page he has said that "agreement with reality must finally be abandoned as a criterion." And if all departures from reality are mistakes, then it would seem that fictions, defined by Vaihinger elsewhere as "consciously false assumptions, which either contradict reality or

are even contradictory in themselves" (HV, pp. xlvi-xlvii), would certainly be mistakes and the thesis of his whole book would be cancelled.

Keeping in mind Vaihinger's original definition of fictions as "hypotheses which are known to be false but which are used because of their utility," it would seem that he also almost breaks down his theory in the following statement: "The mind has a tendency to bring all ideational contents into equilibrium and to establish an unbroken connection between them. An hypothesis is inimical to this tendency in so far as it involves the idea that it is not to be placed on an equality with the other objective ideas" (HV, p. 125). He then admits that a fiction even more than an hypothesis "interferes with the tendency toward an equilibration of ideational constructs. The hypothesis only hampers this adjustment negatively and indirectly, but the fiction hampers it directly and positively" (HV, p. 126). But a great part of his argument for fictions has been their "utility" in smoothing out thought processes in spite of the fact that they are "consciously false assumptions, which either contradict reality or are even contradictory in themselves . . ." (HV, pp. xlvi-xlvii). In fact, just five pages beyond his above statement about fiction "interfering directly and positively with the tendency toward an equilibration of ideational constructs," he seems to reverse himself by considering fictions as beneficial in promoting the working of the "law of the resolution of psychical tension": "One beneficial effect is that by this tendency to adjustment dogmas and hypotheses are, where possible or expedient, transformed into fictions. For so long as these ideational constructs are supposed to have objective value, contradictions and difficulties arise which disappear if we regard them as mere fictions" (HV, p. 133). Once more Vaihinger has contradicted himself about contradictions as well as about the effect on the psyche of fictions.

Again in this same chapter entitled "The Law of Ideational Shifts," Vaihinger's attitude toward the history of religions seems ambiguous if not actually contradictory. He has all along indicated that to consider religious dogma as fiction is not only the best but indeed the only proper way to consider it. He agrees with the philosopher Forberg that "it is not a duty to believe that there exists a moral world-government or a God as moral world-ruler; our duty is

simply to act *as if* we believed it" (HV, p. 323). He has, as we have seen, even gone so far as to say that "as soon as this *as if* is transformed into a *because*, its purely ethical character vanishes and it becomes simply a matter of our lower interests, mere egotism" (HV, p. 49)—which would certainly imply that the quality of religion is vastly improved when the *because*, which sometimes comes first, is transformed into an *as if*, which "small psychical artifice . . . becomes the origin of all the idealistic belief and behaviour of mankind" (HV, p. 49). That is, belief and behaviour based on God, immortality, reward, punishment, etc., as *hypotheses* are not really idealistic; indeed their ethical character is "destroyed." Keeping in mind his repeated emphasis on the above ideas, it is curious that he definitely connects his "law of ideational shifts" with the "decline and break-up" (one would have expected him to say "the great improvement") of religion (the shift being from dogma to hypothesis to fiction as the religion declines more and more). "At first," he says,

> all religion consists of general dogmas. . . . Then doubt appears and the idea becomes an hypothesis. As doubt grows stronger, there are some who reject the idea entirely, while others maintain it either as a public or a private fiction. This last condition is typical of every religion so far known when it has reached a certain age. It can be seen to great advantage in Greek religion, where the Greek folk-deities were at first general dogmas. . . . Subsequently they became fictions for the educated classes, who adhered tenaciously to the worship of God, or rather of the gods, although convinced that the ideas represented nothing real.

The most extensive series of errors in Vaihinger's book are revealed in his valiant efforts to make Kant his ally in considering as fictions rather than hypotheses the Thing-in-itself, God, immortality, liberty, and other such ideas not scientifically verifiable. In Part I he finds himself disappointed because Kant "wavers between the *Ding an sich*, as an hypothesis or a fiction" (HV, p. 74). Kant's system, says Vaihinger, logically demanded the *Ding an sich* as a fiction.

> Just as we introduce into mathematics and mechanics ideas which facilitate our task, so Kant introduces a device in the form of the concept *Ding an sich*, as an x to which a y,

> the ego, as our organization, corresponds. By this means the whole world of reality can be dealt with. Subsequently the 'ego' and the *Ding an sich* are dropped, and only sensations remain as real. From our point of view the sequence of sensations constitutes ultimate reality, and two poles are mentally added, subject and object. (HV, pp. 75-76)

This kind of temporary use of the *Ding an sich,* Vaihinger is saying, like the temporary use of "fictitious constructs—space, matter, etc.," mentioned above, would have done Kant credit. In other words, the Thing-in-itself would have been "the most brilliant of all conceptual instruments" if Kant had used it temporarily as a fiction so that "the whole world" might "appear to be understood as an effect," and if he had then dropped it to accept the mature wisdom of Vaihinger's basic doctrine that "only sensations remain as real." But unfortunately Kant "did not adhere to this definite standpoint, but his *Ding an sich* became a *reality,* in short an *hypothesis,* and hence his hesitating discussion of the concept" (HV, p. 76). "The great philosopher stained his glorious discoveries by clinging to effete rationalistic dogmas and thus himself contributed to the fate of his true achievement, which was consigned to oblivion" (HV, p. 30).

Vaihinger can never, in Part I of his book, stop chiding Kant for not consistently maintaining the point of view that his scientifically unverifiable ideas were fictions. Though the misguided Kant did not consistently hold to this view, in ethics, for example, Vaihinger states

> what constitutes the real principle of Kantian ethics, namely, that true morality must always rest upon a *fictional* basis. All the *hypothetical* bases, God, immortality, reward, punishment, etc., destroy its ethical character, i. e. we must act with the same seriousness and the same scruples *as if* the duty were imposed by God. . . . But as soon as this *as if* is transformed into a *because,* its purely ethical character vanishes and it becomes simply a matter of our lower interests, mere egotism. (HV, p. 49)

In other words, Vaihinger is saying that all the religious believers, including the great saints, who have not regarded as fictions "the *hypothetical* bases, God, immortality, reward, punishment, etc.," have

acted out of "lower interests, mere egotism." This would of course include Christ himself.

Another slightly puzzling idea in the above explanation of what, even if Kant did not have insight enough to maintain it, constitutes "the real principle of Kantian ethics" is the statement that "true morality must always rest upon a fictional basis." But why, one wonders, cannot the fiction of morality, as Vaihinger has argued for the Thing-in-itself, be kept up only temporarily until the psyche is ready for the mature wisdom of his doctrine that "only sensations remain as real"? Perhaps we will understand the distinction in due time. In the meantime, it is pleasant to contemplate the soaring eloquence of his next sentence: "Thus, before our very eyes, does a small psychical artifice not only develop into a mighty source of the whole theoretical explanation of the world—for all categories arise from it—but it also becomes the origin of all the idealistic belief and behaviour of mankind" (HV, p. 49).

Now since such wonderful results flow from this "small psychical artifice," he generously decides that Kant after all must have really meant to be an "As-Ifer" in Vaihinger's sense of the term and devotes forty-seven pages of Part III to arguing thus. It is my firm belief that Vaihinger is mistaken in maintaining that Kant ever considered his transcendental ideas fictions, in Vaihinger's sense of fictions as mental constructs known to be false. First, I cite three passages early in *The Critique of Pure Reason,* which appeared in 1781 and to which Vaihinger devotes more attention than to any other of Kant's works. First, Kant makes it clear that he regards things in themselves as real in the following passage: "The estimate of our rational cognition *a priori* at which we arrive is that it has only to do with phenomena, and that things in themselves, *while possessing a real existence* [italics mine] lie beyond its sphere."[7] Again, on the next page he says:

> . . . while we surrender the power of *cognizing,* we still reserve the power of *thinking* objects, as things in themselves. . . . In order to *cognize* an object, I must be able to prove its possibility, either from its reality as attested by experience, or *a priori,* by means of reason. But I can *think* what I please, provided . . . my conception is a

> possible thought, though I may be unable to answer for the existence of a corresponding object in the sum of possibilities. But something more is required before I can attribute to such a conception objective validity. . . . We are not however confined to theoretical sources of cognition for the means of satisfying this additional requirement, but may derive them from practical sources. (*Critique*, p. 9)

Kant's whole effort in his approach to the subject of God, freedom, immortality, etc., was to "satisfy this additional requirement" so that he could attribute to his concepts the "real possibility" of "objective validity."

And the third passage occurs on the next page, where he says, "I must, therefore, abolish *knowledge*, to make room for *belief*" (*Critique*, p. 10). He certainly was not abolishing knowledge to make room for fictions in Vaihinger's sense of the term, and it is clear that when Kant uses the word which is translated *fiction* he is using it as synonymous with *hypothesis*.

I have quoted these passages from the first few pages of the *Critique of Pure Reason* to indicate that Vaihinger was mistaken in thinking that Kant even began with the idea of the Thing-in-itself as a fiction.

Vaihinger, even in dealing with this work which seems most to favor his view of Kant, carefully selects a few sections for comment and from these quotes portions of passages which seem to make Kant an "As-Ifer" in Vaihinger's sense of the term. But even on the ground selected by Vaihinger his interpretation will not work. He first selects the section entitled "The Discipline of Pure Reason in Hypothesis." "Near the beginning of the section," Vaihinger says, "we find the 'rational concepts' described as 'mere ideas,' as 'heuristic fictions,' and expressly distinguished from hypotheses" (HV, p. 272). But this is exactly what Kant has not done, as would be indicated in the very title of this section, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

> This critique of reason has now taught us that all its efforts to extend the bounds of knowledge, by means of pure speculation, are utterly fruitless. So much the wider field, it may appear, lies open to hypothesis; as, where we cannot know with certainty, we are at liberty to make guesses and to form suppositions. (*Critique*, p. 227)

And the whole section is devoted to this procedure.

In the paragraph referred to by Vaihinger, Kant is concerned as always to make it clear that these hypotheses about the realm of pure reason (the noumena) do not apply in the phenomenal world. "The conceptions of reason are, as we have already shown, mere ideas, and do not relate to any object in any kind of experience." But "mere ideas" are not fictions in Vaihinger's sense of the term. When Kant says that they "cannot be employed as hypotheses in the explanation of real phenomena," he is emphasizing, as he does throughout this paragraph, that one must go as far as possible in the phenomenal world and not confuse it with the noumenal. The noumenal world, though not demonstrable, Kant always considered as necessary, universal, and real in its sphere. Each object indeed has a sensuous character and an intelligible character, the latter by no means to be considered as "imaginary" in spite of the fact that it cannot be experienced as a "real phenomenon." In the past part (entitled "Scepticism not a Permanent State for Human Reason") of Section II immediately preceding this section discussed by Vaihinger, Kant finds Hume defective on this very point. Hume mistakenly "believed he could infer that, without experience, we possess no source from which we can augment a conception, and no ground sufficient to justify us in framing a judgment that is to extend our cognition *a priori*" (*Critique,* p. 226). Vaihinger would take us right back into Hume's error of regarding the ultimate reality as phenomenal, a conclusion which Kant opposes with all his might.

There are undoubtedly some fields in which fictions in Vaihinger's sense are useful, as, for example, the one in the German Commercial Code which provided (at the time Vaihinger was writing, about 1875) that "goods not returned to the sender within the proper time are to be regarded as if the recipient had definitely authorized and accepted them" (HV, p. 35). In mathematics also such fictional constructs as negative, irrational, and imaginary numbers, as Vaihinger says, "possess great value for the advancement of science and the generalization of its results in spite of the crass contradictions which they contain" (HV, p. 57). But granted the limited procedural usefulness of fictions in the sciences, mathematics, jurisprudence, and certain other

fields, Vaihinger's mistake lies in pushing his theory too far into the philosophy of religion, in which analogies with these other fields must be handled with great caution. Vaihinger is correct in saying repeatedly that "Without the imaginary factor neither science nor life in their [*sic*] highest form are [*sic*] possible" (HV, p. 44). But the question is whether the imagination employed in religious speculation, which forms a very important part of Vaihinger's concern with life, issues in hypotheses or fictions. As Vaihinger has well said, an hypothesis sometimes becomes "degraded" into a fiction, but he at the same time seems to feel that such a change is really progress. I should agree that it is well for an honest man to know when an hypothesis is no longer valid as such (that is, cannot lead into eventual truth), but when it is definitely discarded as an hypothesis, then it has little value, either practically or theoretically, in philosophy or religion. Most intelligent people surely cannot shape their lives ultimately around ideas which in their opinion are fictions, though it is amazing how many think they are doing so. Kant may have been wrong, but at least he "abolished *knowledge,* to make room for *belief,*" not for fictions in Vaihinger's sense. The beliefs for which Kant thus made room were the traditional ones in God, freedom, and immortality. Many modern philosophers have acknowledged the genius of Kant's destruction of knowledge about metaphysics but have not been much impressed with his back door return to faith through moralism. It is strange, however, that some who thus condemn Kant will accept as perfectly convincing a system like that of Vaihinger. Such a system would appear to be indeed a desperate shift—evidence of the last stage of a culture when many sophisticated thinkers, having lost religious faith, cannot abide the consequences of its disappearance and have taken a precarious refuge under the flimsy shelter of fictions—a procedure in some respects fully as naive as primitive word-magic. Language, the ultimate reality through "autonomous" symbolism, is our refuge; such is the message of a prominent school of modern philosophers.[8] The same idea is a fundamental one for I. A. Richards, who has an international reputation as a psychologist, literary critic, and poet, and who can speak with authority for a large group in each of these three fields. Richards in his *Coleridge on the Imagination*

speaks almost ecstatically about the prospect of "a general theoretical study of language capable of opening to us new powers over our minds comparable to those which systematic physical inquiries are giving us over our environment."[9] For Richards the gospel of language will take the form of poetry (this of course in the tradition of Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma* and much speculation since that time): "If philosophic contemplation, or religious experience, or science gave us Reality," says Richards,

> then poetry gave us something of less consequence, at best some sort of shadow. If we grant that all is myth, poetry, as the myth-making which most brings 'the whole soul of man into activity' . . . becomes the necessary channel for the reconstitution of order . . . poetry . . . will remake our minds and with them our world.[10]

But other poets, though like Richards in proclaiming the gospel of poetry, seem considerably less happy about it than he. In the sinuous paradoxes of Wallace Stevens—for example, his "Profundum, physical thunder, dimensions in which we believe without belief, beyond belief"—[11] there is an undercurrent of melancholy, as, to return to the philosophers, there certainly is in the more violent paradoxes of two prominent modern German existentialists, Jaspers and Heidegger. Says Jaspers: "Just as Being and Nothingness are inseparable, each containing the other, yet each violently repelling the other, so faith and unfaith are inseparable, yet passionately repel one another."[12] And Heidegger:

> Does Nothing exist only because the Not, i. e., negation, exists? Or is it the other way about? Does negation and the Not exist only because Nothing exists? Where shall we seek Nothing? . . . Only in the clear night of dread's Nothingness is what-is as such revealed in all its original overtness: that it is 'is' and is not Nothing . . . the Nothing nothings.[13]

All the above are various versions, differing only in tone and degree, of the theory of fictions, even though some theorists, like Stevens and the two German existentialists, have evolved the most ingenious fiction of all—that their system both is and is not fiction. There are many other modern versions of the same As-If system, and

I propose to treat a number of them later. There are certainly enough to justify the statements of Ogden and Gilson (quoted in the beginning of this essay) that the philosophy of As If is a very powerful influence in our age. Apropos of all this, my contention, quite simply, is that if one cannot believe, he must prepare himself to forego the consolations that reward the believer, and try, even if in vain without divine assistance, to find in human relationships a source for his "emotional equilibration."

---

[1]Hans Vaihinger, *The Philosophy of 'As If'* (London, 1924), pp. xlvii-xlviii (hereafter referred to as HV).

[2]*Ibid.*, Preface, p. vi.

[3]C. K. Ogden (ed.), *Bentham's Theory of Fictions* (London, 1932), p. cxlviii.

[4]Etienne Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York, 1952), pp. 294-295.

[5]Referred to in Ogden, Introduction, p. xxxiii.

[6]*Bentham's Theory of Fictions*, p. 8.

[7]Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Pure Reason*, in *Great Books of the Western World* (Chicago, 1952), LXII, 8—hereafter referred to as *Critique*.

[8]Cf. Ernst Cassirer, *Language and Myth* (New York, 1946) and Mrs. Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (New York, 1942), and the books to which they refer.

[9]I. A. Richards, *Coleridge on the Imagination* (New York, 1935), p. 232.

[10]*Ibid.*, pp. 228, 229.

[11]Quoted in Jacques Maritain, *Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry* (New York, 1953), p. 181.

[12]Quoted in Hector Hawton, *The Feast of Unreason* (London, 1952), p. 200.

[13]Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 188.

F. Marion Crawford's Lecture Tour 1897 - 1898

John Pilkington, Jr.

At the close of the Civil War the lyceum, which had served as an instrument of adult education to vast numbers of Americans, underwent notable changes.[1] James Redpath made it more a vehicle of entertainment than of education and established the position of lecture manager through whom local lyceums could secure popular speakers. After Redpath's withdrawal from active participation in the lyceum in 1875, Major James Burton Pond became the greatest of all lecture managers. He continued the trend, initiated by Redpath, toward commercialization and achieved considerable national fame and literary importance through his successful management of a long list of political and literary personages. Three years before his death in 1903, Pond published a series of reminiscences of persons whose lecture tours he had managed.[2] In one of these sketches he briefly described the coast-to-coast lecture tour of Francis Marion Crawford during the winter of 1897-1898. Pond's short summary has remained the only published account of this lecture tour.[3]

Crawford, then at the height of his popularity as a novelist whose Italian and American stories had fascinated readers for almost two decades, agreed with Pond upon the terms of the lecture series by the middle of March, 1897, when *The Critic* announced that he would deliver a hundred lectures in the fall of that year.[4] Earlier Crawford had written his friend, Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner of Boston, that

he would lecture on the lives and surroundings of early Italian artists and about Italian home life in the Middle Ages.[5] For both parties there was good reason for satisfaction about the proposed venture. Pond, on his part, knew what he was getting, for during the winter of 1892-1893 Crawford had given under Pond's management a series of readings from his novels. Although critics had not praised Crawford's performances very highly, he had proved to be a good attraction by virtue of his fame as a novelist. Moreover, Pond, who doubtless kept a shrewd glance on current fiction, would have known that the best-seller lists were then full of historical novels, some of the most popular of which dealt with Italy. For Pond, therefore, Crawford was a good business risk because of his fame and the popularity of his subject matter.

For Crawford, the lecture tour seemed to have a number of advantages. Now forty-three years of age, he had published twenty-nine immensely popular novels and had tried his hand, with no great success, at play-writing. He was beginning to seek new material. Within the past two years he had become interested in Italian history and had already published several articles on the subject. The research which he had accomplished for these articles would provide part of the material for the coming lectures which, as he wrote Mrs. Gardner, would become part of a non-fiction book on Italy.[6] Doubtlessly Crawford estimated that the lecture tour would afford him a good return at a minimum output. In addition, the lectures would keep his name and person before the public across the country thereby stimulating interest in his previous and future work. Thus it is fair to conclude that the lecture tour was planned under conditions favorable for both Pond and Crawford.

The book which Crawford mentioned to Mrs. Gardner eventually became *Ave Roma Immortalis*.[7] Although he had been working on the volume for some time, he had done nothing with it while he was in New York during the winter of 1896-1897 helping with his unsuccessful play *Dr. Claudius*. On March 13, 1897, after he had signed the contract with Pond, Crawford sailed for his home in Sorrento, Italy, to complete the projected book on Italy, to prepare for the lecture tour, and to write another play. His writing program during

the summer was severely curtailed by the illness of his mother. He finished neither the book nor the play; and although he did complete the lectures, he would have cancelled the tour if he could have broken the contract without heavy financial loss.[8] Instead he returned to this country early in October, 1897, to begin his speaking engagements under the management of Pond.

II

Major Pond had planned the novelist's itinerary with considerable skill. Crawford was to begin with performances before small groups in the East, make his first appearance in front of a large metropolitan audience in Chicago, and then return East for lectures to Boston and New York audiences. In February and early March his tour would take him as far south as New Orleans and thence to Kansas City and across the continent, arriving in California during the last week in March. For the following six weeks he would lecture on the West Coast and then turn east for engagements along the northern route until the tour ended in Duluth, Minnesota. Pond later remarked that this was "one of the most extensive and successful tours I have ever made with a star."[9]

Crawford opened with a lecture before a literary club in Bridgeport, Connecticut, on the night of October 28, 1897. After several engagements in the East, he went to Chicago where he was the guest of honor at a banquet and a reception given by the Press Club and the Quadrangle Club.[10] He delivered two lectures there at Central Music Hall—one on November 16, and the other on November 18. In between these two engagements he addressed the students of Notre Dame University on November 17. Since the performance in Chicago represented the first real test of his powers to attract large audiences in metropolitan centers, Crawford must have been greatly pleased by the excellent press notices which he received in the Chicago papers[11] and by the fact that the New York *Herald* reprinted virtually his entire speech at the Press Club banquet.[12]

Early in December, Crawford was speaking in the Boston area, familiar territory to him since it was the home of his aunt, Julia

Ward Howe, at whose home he had lived as a boy and during the years he was beginning to write his novels. Introduced by the Reverend Timothy Brosnahan, president of Boston College, Crawford spoke before a crowded audience at Boston College Hall on December 1.[13] The next evening he lectured in Sanders Theatre at Harvard under the auspices of the Cantabrigia Club.[14] Throughout December and January, he continued to lecture in the East, concluding his performances in this section of the country with talks in New York at the Astor Gallery of the Astoria on January 7, 1898,[15] at Xavier College on January 31,[16] and at the Staten Island Academy on February 1.[17] In view of the fact that many of these places were schools, one infers that his lectures were considered educational as well as entertaining; indeed, throughout the tour Crawford spoke on many occasions to students and faculties of educational institutions.

After arranging to meet Major Pond in Kansas City on March 12, Crawford left for a tour of Southern cities. Very probably this Southern tour was planned around his participation in the Catholic Winter School in New Orleans at which the novelist was to give the entire series of his lectures. He was to be in New Orleans from February 24 to March 1. On the way Crawford was booked for engagements in Memphis, Tennessee, on February 19; in Louisville, Kentucky, February 21; and in Nashville, Tennessee, on February 22. Pond had made the arrangements for Crawford's appearances very carefully. In each instance newspaper publicity preceded his arrival; advertisements offering reserve seats for fifty cents were inserted in papers the week before his address—the price in the North had been one dollar—and a full report of the lecture was carried the following day. After every performance, a literary, religious, or press club gave a reception in his honor.

By the time he reached Louisville, Crawford was beginning to feel the strain of the lecture routine. He wrote Mrs. Gardner:

> Things go well enough with me. I have big audiences, and good notices, and people cry "Success" after me, as it were. I wonder what success means, after all! It certainly does not mean satisfaction. Like the daughters of the horse leech, we cry "Give, give!" and we get, and we want

> more, and nothing satisfies us,—and the higher we climb, if it *is* higher—the further the top of "Mount Ambition" seems to be from us. . . . I cannot write more, for the reporters are bothering me, and I hear a "reception"—a thing of terror! And a great audience again tonight.[18]

The Louisville *Courier-Journal* reported that Library Hall was filled to capacity that evening.[19] At the Vendome in Nashville, the Catholic clergy occupied all of the boxes on one side of the stage, and the management sold standing room to demanding patrons. The inevitable reception followed the lecture.[20] Very likely his comments on audiences, reporters, and receptions were justified, for in many respects the tour was a grueling and monotonous routine.

Crawford's lectures at the Catholic Winter School in New Orleans constitute the high point of his entire tour. They represent his most sustained success, for on four evenings he maintained and even increased the enthusiastic response of a highly critical audience.[21] On the opening night he was introduced as "the greatest living American novelist."[22] Newspaper accounts of his performances support the comment made by the reporter for the *Daily Picayune* in an article written after the series was completed: "For five days Mr. Crawford has been in the city, lecturing night after night to the most cultivated and distinguished audiences, standing room being at a premium. . . . His leisure hours have all been taken up, the most distinguished social attentions being lavished upon him, and the best people vying with one another as to who should have the honor of claiming Mr. Crawford for an hour in their homes."[23] The Catholic clergy were especially lavish in their praises of Crawford's addresses.

New Orleans, moreover, was the only city visited by Crawford in which he had the opportunity to present his complete lecture course. He had originally planned four discourses: "Pope Leo XIII and the Vatican," "Early Italian Artists," "The Middle Ages in Rome," and "Modern Sicilian Life." In New Orleans he gave the first three lectures, but in place of "Modern Sicilian Life" he substituted by special request one called "Early Experiences in India and Mr. Isaacs." This last lecture which he had developed during the tour from a brief, informal talk for banquets and receptions into a lengthy address became,

with the account of Pope Leo XIII, his most popular subject. It is unlikely that the lecture on "Modern Sicilian Life" was given during the entire tour.

Crawford's New Orleans engagement represented a personal triumph achieved to a considerable extent through his own determination to succeed. He arrived in the city suffering from a severe cold, but he refused to postpone his lecture. After his second appearance, the *Daily Picayune* reported that "Mr. Crawford was laboring under a severe attack of grippe and neuralgia and left the lecture hall to go at once to his hotel and to consult a physician."[24] Regardless of his physical condition, Crawford finished the series at New Orleans; moved on to lecture in Corsicana and other cities in Texas; joined Major Pond in Kansas City; and spoke there on March 12.[25] He was apparently still suffering from a bronchial infection, and he later told Pond that "he had had two hemorrhages . . . and that his left lung was very sore" but that "he intended to finish the tour no matter what the sacrifice, if it were possible."[26]

Years later, recalling the trip westward from Kansas City, Pond emphasized the novelist's cheerfulness and unfailing good humor; but Crawford's letters sounded a rather gloomy note. From Colorado Springs, he wrote Mrs. Gardner:

> You have been here, I suppose, and you know what it is like. Just now it is bleak and desolate, and Pike's Peak looks rather small in the distance, and it is altogether not to be compared with my expectations, which were founded on other people's big talk. I am going steadily on my way, speaking every night, and I have done it so long now that things will probably go well to the end, as they generally do with indestructible people. A different city, a different hall, another audience every night—that is the round. It would be dreary if I had not a set purpose of doing it—but nothing bores one which one means to accomplish, and which is hard.[27]

The difference between the somewhat pessimistic and dreary outlook which he expressed in his private correspondence and the optimistic appearance that he presented to his business manager may have been

due to the ill health which continued to plague him throughout the lecture tour.

From Colorado Springs, where Crawford spoke before a large audience on the evening of March 15 at the Temple Theatre,[28] the two men continued their journey across the continent, the novelist lecturing wherever Pond had scheduled a performance. Most notable were the engagements at Provo and Salt Lake City, Utah. At Provo, Crawford gave his speech on "Pope Leo XIII and the Vatican" to the student body of the Brigham Young Normal College, a training school for Mormon missionaries. Although Crawford was unaccustomed to being interrupted while speaking, he was so delighted with the questions asked by the students that he sent the college a complete set of his novels.[29] At Salt Lake City the Roman Catholic bishop, four Mormon bishops, and clergymen of all the denominations represented in the city attended his lecture in the Methodist church.[30] In his account of the reception which followed the lecture, Pond stressed the interdenominational character of Crawford's appeal:

> The reception to the lecturer by the Ladies' Press Club was held in the historic Bee-hive House, the former home of Brigham Young, where Mary Ann Angel, his first, and, as he claimed in his will, his legitimate wife, and a number of other wives had lived. Mormons and Gentiles were about equally represented. Among those present were some of the prophet's daughters and many of his grandchildren and other former polygamous wives. There were army officers from Fort Douglas, with their wives, the Presbyterian and Episcopalian ministers and their wives, all mingling with one another without prejudice. From all appearances they were mutually enjoying the occasion. To me it seemed strange.[31]

Pond's observation about the strangeness of the group at the reception fails to take into account the basis of the novelist's popularity. Although in private life he was a Catholic, his public career had never been closely associated with religion. Many of his Italian novels, it is true, contained Catholic characters; but he had never used his fiction to inculcate or to support a specifically Catholic point of view. So little publicity had ever been given to his religious affiliation that

probably very few of his readers were even aware of his religion. Though the Catholic clergy supported his lectures and his subjects included Pope Leo XIII, his audiences came to hear him much more because of his contemporary fame as a great American novelist and because of a non-sectarian interest in the Pope than because of his private religious conviction. In a place so remote from the entertainment centers of the East as Salt Lake City, such an occasion as the visit of F. Marion Crawford was an event of great importance.

Salt Lake City was merely a prelude to the tremendous reception Crawford was to receive on the West Coast. His arrival in San Francisco from Ogden, Utah, was featured with great prominence by the two leading newspapers, the *Chronicle* and the *Call* on March 26.[32] The former presented a full column account illustrated with a large picture of the novelist, the story consisting mainly of a long sketch of Crawford's career. The article in the *Call,* set in double column width, began by stating, "There is wonderful vitality in Marion Crawford, whose name, as the writer of many successful novels, is known from one end of the Union to the other."[33] The newspaper devoted the remainder of the story to Crawford's comments about his lecture tour, the West, and his method of writing; only a brief portion was biographical. Thereafter both papers printed long and detailed accounts of the novelist's lectures.[34]

Under the auspices of the Young Men's Institute lecture bureau, Crawford spoke three times to large audiences in the California Theatre of San Francisco. His first lecture, delivered on March 28, was "Leo XIII and the Vatican." On the following evening he presented for his second engagement the expanded version of his own life-story which the San Francisco papers entitled the "Original Mr. Isaacs' Early Newspaper Experience in India." And on March 30, his final appearance, the title was reported as "Medieval Life in Italy." Thus Crawford, with the exception of the lecture on "Early Italian Artists," repeated the series that had been received with great enthusiasm in New Orleans. The order of his subjects in San Francisco suggests that Crawford himself rated the appeal of his lectures in the order given and makes it questionable whether he gave the lecture on

"Early Italian Artists" more than a very few times during the entire tour.

The character of his audiences in San Francisco was typical of his experience elsewhere on the trip. Reviewing the lecture on "Pope Leo XIII," the *Chronicle* noted the capacity crowd in attendance and added, "Doubtless the same people had sat many times at the feet of Crawford, the writer, and the fact that there were other notable, if less intellectual, attractions in town did not prevent the audience from being cultured and fashionable. . . ."[35] Taking cognizance of the fact that the Young Men's Institute was a Catholic organization, the same paper observed that "the institute, with broad liberality, had invited men of other faiths to act as vice-presidents. Besides well-known Catholics, Rabbi Nieto, Julius Kahn and Irving Scott were prominently placed."[36] To support the contention that the occasion was a fashionable one, the reporter wrote that "Representative people occupied the boxes—the Frank Sullivans, the Casserlys, the De Youngs, the McDades. Representative men sat upon the stage. . . ."[37] The same paper printed the guest list of the Forum Club which honored Crawford at the customary reception. Crawford was treated as a celebrity of first rank as indeed he was.

The remainder of Crawford's tour of the West Coast appears to have been a long succession of triumphs, marred only by his illness. Major Pond recalled that in San Francisco Crawford told him that the lung ailment which had been evident as they traveled west from Kansas City had become increasingly severe and that a physician had advised him to close the tour and return to New York. At the time Pond apparently counselled caution pointing out the importance of health over money, for in his memoirs he wrote, "I cared nothing whatever as to the business part of it—that never entered my mind; but I assured Mr. Crawford that I would not be the means of his breaking down for a dozen fortunes."[38] But Crawford's daughter later recalled that the novelist wanted to interrupt the lectures but that Pond was unwilling to abandon the tour.[39] For whatever reason Crawford did continue the lecture tour speaking in Southern California and then back up the coast to Seattle; Victoria, British Columbia; and Portland. At this point he turned back eastward to Helena,

Montana; Winnipeg, Canada; Fargo, North Dakota; and Duluth, Minnesota, where, according to Crawford, the tour ended on April 30, 1898.[40] Tired from constant lecturing and ill from the lung ailment that had troubled him ever since he left New Orleans, he hastened back to New York and from there to his home in Sorrento.

III

By sheer determination Crawford had fulfilled all of his engagements, and he had been successful. The chief factor which contributed to his outstanding success was the content of his lectures. As originally planned, four of them contained the general theme of Italian life and art in both the present and the past. Heard in their entirety, they could have constituted a coherent sequence which would have appealed to the interest and imagination of Americans at a time when American tourists in unprecedented numbers were beginning to travel to Europe in search of culture. But it is doubtful that they were ever given as a complete course. The logical arrangement of his material would have placed the "Middle Ages in Rome" first, followed in order by "Early Italian Artists," "Modern Sicilian Life," and "Pope Leo XIII and the Vatican." This last lecture proved to be so outstanding that Crawford chose it above the others as his main attraction.[41] Second in popularity, measured by newspaper accounts, was the lecture on Mr. Isaacs, which had begun as an informal talk about himself. Thus except in such places as New Orleans and San Francisco where he was asked to give three or four performances, Crawford delivered the lecture on Pope Leo XIII; and if he had the opportunity for a second appearance, he offered the expanded biographical account of his own experiences.

Despite the infrequency with which Crawford delivered the material on Italian life, contemporary accounts are sufficiently complete to indicate the principal emphasis of the lecture. He began the address on the "Middle Ages in Rome" with an account of the desolation of the city during the time of the Rienzi.[42] He placed great emphasis on the social conditions of the period which he contrasted with those of modern Rome. He briefly sketched the rise of the feudal barons and the establishment of the house of Colonna, described from first hand

knowledge several of the castles in and near Rome, and related in some detail the story of Vittoria Accoramboni. Crawford had a deep, personal interest in the career of Vittoria, for as a boy he had lived in the Villa Negroni where Francesco Peretti and Vittoria lived after their marriage. The artistic monuments of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance he left to his next lecture.

Crawford's abandonment of the lecture on "Early Italian Artists" may explain his willingness to permit *Book Reviews* to publish excerpts from it while he was still lecturing.[43] These excerpts and the full newspaper account of the address published in the New Orleans *Daily Picayune*[44] probably comprise an accurate summary of what Crawford said.

His main thesis in this lecture was the superiority of the Italian Renaissance artists over modern workers. In *Book Reviews*, he stated his premise as follows:

> Art is not dependent on the creations of genius alone. It is also the result of developing manual skill to the highest degree. Without genius, works of art might as well be turned out by machinery; without manual skill, genius could have no means of expression. As a matter of fact, in our own time, it is the presence of genius, without manual skill, or foolishly despising it, that has produced a sort of school called the impressionist.[45]

The newspaper reporter for the *Daily Picayune* probably conveyed the added forcefulness of Crawford when making the point orally:

> He [Crawford] said, in opening, that art was, in a large degree, dependent upon manual-dexterity, although not wholly. Lacking the mechanical skill, genius cannot fully express its ideas. This is seen in the works of modern impressionist painters, in whose pictures the magnitude of the conception is often hopelessly in conflict with the inadequacy of the technical rendition thereof.[46]

The painters of the Italian Renaissance, suggested Crawford, were superior to the modern impressionists in the mechanical ability to draw and paint; and he asserted that the art of the Renaissance was "higher and nobler than that of to-day" because the artists were "men

of universal learning and genius."[47] "Nothing was merely for effect," he was quoted as saying; "Their art seemed to compare itself with an ideal future. . . . Modern art is more theatrical. It may be said to compare itself with an ideal past, and to appeal to men's eyes."[48] Crawford meant that the modern impressionists sought to capture a reality that was of necessity in the past; whereas the Renaissance artists endeavored to express an ideal or vision yet to be realized. The impressionists represented the momentary scene; the Renaissance men expressed man's idea of moral perfection. From this frame of reference Crawford examined the lives and work of a number of important Italian artists. Conservative as this criticism was, it nonetheless reflected at the turn of the century a widely respected and accepted point of view.

The comparison between the artists of the past and those of the present in the lecture on "Early Italian Artists" could have served not merely as the focal point of that lecture but also as a device for making a transition from Italian life of the early period to modern times. Logically the next lecture in the series was that advertised as "Modern Sicilian Life." No full account of this lecture has been found; but as Crawford was leaving New Orleans, a reporter asked him to comment on the Sicilian character and the Mafia. His reply probably included the basic points of the lecture he may never have delivered during the tour. "The Sicilians," remarked Crawford, "are the boldest, the strongest, the bravest and the most intelligent of any other Italians."[49] He pointed to the successful resistance of the Sicilians against the salt tax as an instance of their independence of character. The outstanding Sicilians he chose as examples were Crispi, Rudini, and Cardinal Rampolla. Although Crawford maintained that he did not know a great deal about the Mafia in Sicily, he defined it as "a sort of universal organized opposition to all government whatever, and for the sole advantage of Sicilians."[50]

In "Pope Leo XIII and the Vatican," the fourth lecture dealing with Italian life, Crawford continued his discussion of modern times, focusing attention on a great contemporary figure against a background of the past. It was a topic which he was well qualified to discuss because of his long residence in Italy, his friendship with officials

of the Vatican, and his intensive study of Italian history. The subject had been in his mind for considerable time. Almost two years before the lecture tour, he had published in the *Century Magazine* an article entitled "Pope Leo XIII and His Household."[51] The very full newspaper accounts of his lecture during the tour strongly suggest that Crawford used the article in the *Century Magazine* as the basis for his analysis of "Pope Leo XIII and the Vatican." The lecture in turn served as the essence of the chapter on "Leo the Thirteenth" in *Ave Roma Immortalis,* the book which he was completing during the lecture tour.

There can be little question that the lecture on "Pope Leo XIII and the Vatican" was the most carefully prepared, the best organized, and the most striking of the Italian series. In preparing for it Crawford divided his material into three rather distinct topics. He began with a sketch of the political conditions in Europe during the nineteenth century, paying particular attention to the connections between European politics and the Catholic Church. He concluded this section of his address by establishing a contrast between the work of Pius IX and that of Leo XIII, suggesting that with the death of Pius IX an unprogressive era ended in Rome. Into this frame of reference, Crawford fitted the second portion of his lecture, which consisted largely of a biographical sketch of Pope Leo XIII and an elaborate description of the daily routine of the pontiff. If one can judge from newspaper accounts, it was this part of Crawford's speech that was most admired by his hearers. The third and last section of the lecture contained an analysis of the Pope's official life with respect to both religious and diplomatic activities. Near the end of the lecture Crawford emphasized the Pope's disinclination to interfere with the consciences of American Catholics in the matter of voting. Stressing the Pope's efforts to formulate a reasoned defense of orderly society against radical political theories, Crawford concluded:

> Leo XIII is at the head of a great body of human thought. He will not be there when the battle between anarchy and order is fought, but when the time comes the roads such men as he have planned are open and broad for the tread of many feet. The sword they forged is for use by many

> hands and they themselves in their graves have their share
> in the victories that humanize mankind.[52]

Crawford's audiences must have felt that they were listening to a man who could at one moment take them inside the Vatican to watch the Pope as he followed his daily routine and at the next moment enable them to grasp the significance of the pontiff's actions in historical perspective. As Crawford himself said, it was his most popular lecture.[53] Wherever he delivered it, the audience and the press responded in flattering terms. When he decided to use it for single engagements in preference to the other lectures, he undoubtedly made the best choice.

Second only to the address on the Pope in popularity and frequency of delivery was the lecture on "Early Experiences in India and Mr. Isaacs." It appealed strongly to the thousands of Crawford's readers who were interested not only in the novels but also in the man who wrote them. Brief sketches of the novelist's career had appeared in various newspapers and periodicals, but never before had the autobiographical background of Crawford's first novel, *Mr. Isaacs: A Tale of Modern India* (1882), been narrated in such detail as Crawford presented to his listeners during his lecture tour. In a speech lasting an hour and a half, he recounted for his hearers how his interest in a Sanskrit grammar had led him to India where he hoped to continue his studies. His finances soon became exhausted; and he was about to enlist in the British army when almost miraculously he was offered a position in Allahabad as editor of the *Indian Herald.* While editing this paper, he met the celebrated Mr. Jacob, an Indian diamond merchant, who subsequently became the original of Mr. Isaacs, the hero of Crawford's novel. After discussing the exploits of Mr. Jacob, Crawford related the circumstances which prompted his uncle, Samuel Ward, to suggest that Crawford write a novel based on the Jacob story.

With the record of his adventures in India, Crawford skillfully interspersed accounts of the almost phenomenal feats of magic which he had seen performed by Indian conjurers. He explained the celebrated mango-seed trick and the equally famous Indian rope trick on the grounds of mass hypnotism. He asserted that Madame Blavat-

sky was responsible for the belief that these and other incidents of Indian magic were manifestations essential to Eastern occultism. The novelist admitted, however, that the teachings of the well known theosophist had probably suggested to him portions of his novel. His conclusion, which seemed fully evident from the content of the lecturer, was that "there was very little fiction that was absolutely destitute of facts."[54]

IV

The critical enthusiasm which Crawford's lectures received from the press during his lecture tour in 1897-1898 must have been a source of great satisfaction to Crawford and to Major Pond. Six years earlier, when Crawford under Pond's management had given readings from his novels, the critics had been blunt in their remarks. In 1892 the Boston *Evening Transcript* had noted that "it may as well be said at once that as a reader . . . Mr. Crawford has precisely the abilities and claims, and no other, of any well-bred and intelligent gentleman who may pick up a book from a drawing-room table and read a chapter or two to his friends."[55] And the critic added, "he has not, as yet, outgrown the exceedingly primitive idea that intense feeling is invariably to be indicated by raising the voice."[56] The Brooklyn *Daily Eagle* with equal brutality had declared: "The matter of the reader was brilliant and dramatic; the manner was decidedly lacking in these qualities. He reads with all the stiffness and awkwardness of an Englishman having one voice for all the characters and being incapable of doing his own works anything like justice."[57] The reporter added a comment that went directly to the source of Crawford's appeal in 1892: "However, the audience had not come to hear an elocutionist but to listen to a great novelist reading brilliant passages from his own works."[58]

Although there can be little doubt that many persons came to hear Crawford lecture in the winter of 1897-1898 because they felt he was, as the San Francisco *Chronicle* said, "the first novelist of America,"[59] it is nevertheless true that Crawford at this time was fully adequate as a lecturer. Initially, his appearance was in his favor,

for as one observer noted, he was "a man of commanding presence."[60] Another reporter commented: "Personally Crawford is a handsome, impressive man. He is tall but so broad shouldered that he does not give the impression of height. He has strong, well-shaped hands. . . . His eyes are frank and pleasant, and his smile is ready and illuminating."[61] His delivery was not dramatic, yet it was often called eloquent in its simplicity and straightforwardness. The following account from the *Chronicle,* though fuller than most comments, is representative of the evaluations of his delivery:

> He is not a magnetic speaker, for he is cool, unimpassioned and deliberate. But he has a fine presence, unstudied gestures, expressive hands, a good voice magnificently handled, an open face that changes expression with every sentence, and, above all, a stock of fine, pure English, and an elevated, though simple, style that places him high among lecturers. His sentences are perfectly formed and balanced, and there is not a single excrescence left unpolished. Yet he is never elocutionary. He is at all times a master of English prose, with a wide and deep vocabulary, and a faculty of vivid, terse description.[62]

The total impression one receives is that Crawford was an effective lecturer, a good talker, a superb story-teller but by no means a professional entertainer, cushion-thumper, or dramatic orator. That he had vastly improved over his performances in 1892 is apparent from the press notices that were almost without exception favorable criticisms of his style of speaking.[63]

Crawford's achievements in his lecture tour of 1897-1898 were not reached without serious cost to himself. From his New Orleans appearances to the conclusion of the tour, he suffered from a lung ailment that became steadily worse; and when he returned to Italy in May, 1898, his health had been permanently injured. Months later he wrote Major Pond that if they ever again undertook such a tour, he would "take a patent reversible, india-rubber coffin which can be used as a bath, overcoat, or pulpit, and can be hermetically sealed so as to bring the lecturer home on ice from the point at which he dies!"[64] Despite his light tone, one surmises that Crawford knew he would never lecture again.

The long trip across the continent was certainly not without positive results, some of which may have been very influential upon Crawford's later career. The financial returns from the venture were probably considerable. But of much greater consequence was the inference, which must have been inescapable to such a man as Crawford, that the popularity of the lectures on Italian life indicated the existence of a large audience responsive to historical, and particularly, to Italian historical subjects. Since 1896 Crawford had been publishing non-fictional articles about Rome, and he was incorporating a number of them with only slight revisions into *Ave Roma Immortalis,*[65] the book which he was finishing while making the lecture tour. Since he was beginning to tire of writing novels, he was seeking new material; and his inclination towards history may have been strengthened or perhaps confirmed by the reception of his lectures. This conclusion takes on additional validity in the light of the fact that a few months after Crawford returned to Italy he remarked that he had been selected to write the official life of Pope Leo XIII.[66] He never published this biography, but from the winter of 1897-1898 the emphasis of his literary activities shifted from fiction to history. Subsequently he did write a number of historical volumes, and at the time of his death in 1909 he was preparing a multi-volume history of Rome in the Middle Ages.

In addition to its significance in the novelist's career, Crawford's lecture tour provides an excellent illustration of what was happening to the lyceum movement during the later part of the nineteenth century. Since 1875 Major Pond and his associates had been steadily increasing the entertainment appeal of the lecture platform and at the same time decreasing its educational value. By Crawford's day it was more inportant for the successful lecturer to delight than to instruct. By feeding the American hunger for the far away places of Italy and India, Crawford did instruct, but his instruction was often incidental to the entertainment.

[1]Research for this article has been made possible partially through a grant from the faculty committee on research of the University of Mississippi. Quotations from the letters of Francis Marion Crawford to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner have been made with the permission of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[2]Major J[ames] B[urton] Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius: Memories of Famous Men and Women of the Platform and Stage* (New York: G. W. Dillingham Company, 1900).

[3]Maud Howe Elliott reprinted excerpts from Pond's account in her book, *My Cousin: F. Marion Crawford* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934), pp. 268-276. Although Mrs. Elliott entitled her chapter "The Grand Tour," less than half of it deals with his lecture tour; she added very little to what Pond had written.

[4]See "Notes," *The Critic,* XXX, n.s. 27 (March 13, 1897), 191.

[5]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, March 1, 1897, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[6]*Ibid.*

[7]As will be seen, Crawford finished it during the lecture tour, but it was not brought out by Macmillan until late in 1898.

[8]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, August 13, 1897, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[9]Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius,* p. 547.

[10]See Chicago *Tribune,* November 14, 1897, p. 6.

[11]See Chicago *Tribune,* November 17, 1897, p. 8; and Chicago *Daily News,* November 18, 1897, p. 4.

[12]New York *Herald,* November 14, 1897, p. 9.

[13]See Boston *Evening Transcript,* December 2, 1897, p. 5; and Boston *Herald,* December 2, 1897, p. 9.

[14]For a full account of his lecture see the Boston *Herald,* December 3, 1897, p. 6; a brief summary can be found in the Boston *Evening Transcript,* December 3, 1897, p. 8.

[15]See New York *Tribune,* January 18, 1898, p. 5; Crawford spoke for the benefit of the scholarship fund of Miss Chisholm's School.

[16]See New York *Tribune,* February 1, 1898, p. 4.

[17]See New York *Tribune,* February 2, 1898, p. 6.

[18]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, February 21, 1898, quoted by permission of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[19]See Louisville *Courier-Journal,* February 22, 1898, p. 5.

[20]See Nashville *Banner,* February 23, 1898, p. 5.

[21]On February 24, 1898, Crawford lectured on "Pope Leo XIII"; on February 25, he spoke on "Early Italian Artists"; on February 26, he presented "The Middle Ages in Rome"; and on February 28, he gave his lecture on "Early Experiences in India and Mr. Isaacs." For full accounts of these lectures, see respectively the New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* February 25, 1898, p. 1; February 26, 1898, p. 12; February 27, 1898, p. 9; and March 1, 1898, p. 11.

[22]New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* February 25, 1897, p. 1.

[23]New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* March 1, 1898, p. 12; the fact that the newspaper printed this very long article after Crawford's four lectures had been given and already reported at length indicates the widespread interest in Crawford and his speeches.

[24]New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* February 27, 1898, p. 9.

[25]For an account of this lecture, see Kansas City *Star,* March 13, 1898, p. 2.

[26]Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius,* p. 462.

[27]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, March 15, 1898, quoted by permission of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[28]Colorado Springs *Gazette,* March 15, 1898, p. 3; and March 16, 1898, p. 3.

[29]See Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius,* p. 458.

[30]*Ibid.,* pp. 458-459.

[31]*Ibid.,* p. 459.

[32]See Francisco *Chronicle,* March 26, 1898, p. 9; and San Francisco *Call,* March 26, 1898, p. 9.

[33]*Ibid.*

[34]See San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 29, 1898, p. 11; San Francisco *Call,* March 29, 1898, p. 11; San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 30, 1898, p. 5; San Francisco *Call,* March 30, 1898, p. 5; and San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 31, 1898, p. 9; advertisements listing many of Crawford's novels appeared in several of these issues.

[35]San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 29, 1898, p. 11.

[36]*Ibid.*

[37]*Ibid.*

[38]Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius,* p. 462.

[39]Letter from Mother Clare Marion-Crawford, April 12, 1951.

[40]See New York *Tribune,* May 8, 1898, p. 2.

[41]*Ibid.*

[42]Perhaps the fullest account of this lecture is found in the New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* February 27, 1898, p. 9; it should be compared with the San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 31, 1898, p. 9.

[43]"The Early Italian Artists," *Book Reviews,* V (February, 1898), 255-260.

[44]February 26, 1898, p. 12.

[45]"The Early Italian Artists," p. 255.

[46]New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* February 26, 1898, p. 12.

[47]*Ibid.*

[48]*Ibid.*

[49]New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* March 1, 1898, p. 12.

[50]*Ibid.* Later Crawford included a long chapter on the Mafia in his book on Sicily; see *The Rulers of the South: Sicily, Calabria, Malta* (2 vols.; New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1900), II, 363-385.

[51]F. Marion Crawford, "Pope Leo XIII and His Household," *The Century Magazine,* LI, n.s. 29 (February, 1896), 590-603.

[52]San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 29, 1898, p. 11; compare *Ave Roma Immortalis,* II, 267.

[53]See New York *Tribune,* February 1, 1898, p. 4.

[54]New Orleans *Daily Picayune,* March 1, 1898, p. 11; for another account of this lecture, see San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 30, 1898, p. 5.

[55]Boston *Evening Transcript,* December 13, 1892, p. 5.

[56]*Ibid.*

[57]Brooklyn *Daily Eagle,* January 26, 1893, p. 10.

[58]*Ibid.*

[59]March 26, 1898, p. 9.

[60]Louisville *Courier-Journal,* February 22, 1898, p. 5.

[61]San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 26, 1898, p. 9.

[62]San Francisco *Chronicle,* March 29, 1898, p. 11.

[63]Only two press notices were unfavorable. The Nashville *Banner,* February 21, 1898, p. 5, complained that his audience was not well enough acquainted with European politics to understand his lecture on Pope Leo XIII, but this deficiency can scarcely be charged to Crawford. The Chicago *Daily News,* November 18, 1898, p. 3, called him a "deliciously distorted American who looks like a boulevardier, talks like a Eurasian guardsman and sneers charmingly at almost everything except Crawford." The same paper continued: "However, he lectures with truth at his back of such vivid and amazing experiences that his most exotic mood sits prettily upon him and his slightest yawn at earth and her ridiculous satellites is a signal for gaping. He talks in the drollest mixture of London and Calcutta, never falters, but runs smoothly along in a groove of perfect language with glib and particular method of phrasing and his own matchless vocabulary."

[64]Pond, *Eccentricities of Genius,* p. 464.

[65]Articles which were incorporated with slight revision into *Ave Roma Immortalis* include "A Kaleidoscope of Rome," *The Century Magazine,* LI, n.s. 29 (January, 1896), 322-340; "Pope Leo XIII and His Household," *The Century Magazine,* LI, n.s. 29 (February, 1896), 590-603; "St. Peter's," *The Century Magazine,* LII, n.s. 30 (July, 1896), 323-339; and "The Vatican," *The Century Magazine,* LII, n.s. 30 (August, 1896), 577-588.

[66]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, October 2, 1898, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

Hume's "Umbrage To The Godly" In His *History Of England*

Charles E. Noyes

JAMES BOSWELL, who delighted in the diversity of his acquaintance, alternated for some years between polar opposites: The Great Moralist, Johnson, in London; and The Great Infidel, David Hume, in Edinburgh. As to Johnson's religious position, Boswell never felt any doubt; as to Hume's, he never felt any certainty. Readers of the *Private Papers from Malahide Castle* will recall that, even in his rather macabre deathbed inquisition of Hume, Boswell failed to obtain complete satisfaction. Boswell's curiosity has passed on to others, and the question of Hume's private religious convictions has exercised the ingenuity of many students of eighteenth century thought.

Ingenuity is certainly required, for the biographical evidence presents paradox after paradox. Hume's enemies among the "unco guid" considered him so irredeemably wicked that in 1755 there was a serious attempt in the General Assembly of Scotland to excommunicate him from the church.[1] Yet Adam Smith later risked odium to publish this estimate of his friend: ". . . I have always considered him . . . as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man, as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit."[2] Hume once told Boswell that "when he heard a man was religious, he concluded he was a rascal."[3] Yet he numbered among his closest friends members of the cloth. Regarded by many as the subverter of all

religious faith, Hume was often simply referred to as "the Atheist." Yet, dining once with a group of Parisian *philosophes,* he ingenuously told his host, Baron Holbach, that he did not believe in atheists—at least he had never seen one.[4]

Hume's philosophical writings present similar contradictions. There are few shrewder strokes at the foundations of orthodox Christianity than the *Essay on Miracles;* and in the subsequent *Natural History of Religion* is a dispassionate attempt to find the origin of all religions in fear and ignorance. Yet elsewhere Hume can refer to the divine source of Christian faith as a point beyond cavil. In the *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* the skeptical Philo, brilliantly attacking the rationality of any religious belief, meticulously refutes the "argument from design"— then laughingly appears to accept it as valid.

Bibliography will show how many studies have been made to determine Hume's own religious position; and a reading of the works there listed will show what inconsistent conclusions have been reached. They range from the familiar accusation of "atheist" and "infidel" to "a criminal skeptic," "a deist," "a deist who did not have time to become an atheist," "a theist," "a believer in the intimacy of his own soul," "a believer" (unqualified), "a sincere believer," and even "a faithful Christian."[5]

Such studies are motivated by more than mere curiosity, however scholarly; for until one has formulated his own concept of Hume's real religious convictions he cannot evaluate many passages in Hume's works with any degree of consistence. For a single example, when Hume states that the diligence of the clergy is highly pernicious in every religion "except the true," with what tone does he speak? Is he sincere? Or cautious? Or ironic?

One approach to the problem which has not previously been exploited is through a study of Hume's treatment of religion in his most popular work, the *History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688.* The present paper is a preliminary study of that treatment.

The *History of England* was the last major work which Hume wrote.[6] Its first volume appeared in 1754, when Hume was forty-

three years old, and at a time when he had at last achieved a notable position in the world of letters. This last point is important. Hume confessed in *My Own Life* that "a love of literary fame" was with him "a ruling passion." But this fame was slow in coming. He complained that his first work, *A Treatise of Human Nature,* had fallen "dead-born from the press" in 1739; and not until 1752, when he published his work on political economy, the *Political Discourses,* was his reputation as a writer and thinker solidly established. When he turned historian, he expected to enhance that reputation.

Volumes of the *History of England* appeared at intervals from 1754 to 1762. Hume worked, in a sense, backwards, dealing first with the Stuarts, then with the Tudors, and finally with pre-Tudor history. The 1754 volume, then, covered the reigns of James I and Charles I. Hume confidently anticipated the applause of his readers. Instead, to quote the somewhat exaggerated statement made in his *My Own Life,* ". . . miserable was my Disappointment: I was assailed by one Cry of Reproach, Disapprobation, and even Detestation."[7]

In part this disapproval resulted from the fact that the temper of the times was Whiggish, and Hume showed an evident sympathy for the Stuarts.[8] Hume made much of this point in *My Own Life.* What he passed over almost in silence was the outcry aroused by his treatment of the religious controversies that so disrupted seventeenth-century England. To some degree this outcry was justified. Like Gibbon, who "sapped a solemn creed with solemn sneer," Hume did not tamper with facts; but he did point up some that might better have been passed over, and his incidental reflections and his choice of language sometimes showed him straying from the impartiality he held up as his ideal. Moreover, there was this difference with regard to his handling of religious as contrasted with political affairs: With the latter, if there were even the appearance of bias, it was toward either King or Parliament, and the advocates of each might take comfort accordingly. But as for the religious antagonists, Hume's attitude seemed often to be " a plague on both—or rather *all*—your houses."

In a study of Hume it would be most unseemly to argue *post hoc ergo propter hoc;* but if Hume's figures are correct, 450 copies of his book sold in Edinburgh alone in the first weeks after publication,

before the furor began, and in the succeeding year only forty-five copies sold anywhere.[9] If the situation were to be retrieved, steps must be taken; and among them, something should be done to quiet the outcries of those Hume dubbed "the godly."

While never given to a pusillanimous saying and then unsaying, Hume on occasions other than this showed himself willing to avoid outraging the religious sensibility of others. When he prepared the manuscript of his *Treatise of Human Nature* for Bishop Butler's perusal, he omitted from it his attack on miracles.[10] He excised two essays, one defending suicide and the other questioning immortality, from one volume of his works when friends pointed out to him how many might be offended by them.[11] He was repeatedly dissuaded from publishing his *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* during his lifetime, leaving them to appear posthumously. While, then, the disappointment over the reception of the first Stuart volume caused Hume to write theatrically of giving up the project and retiring to France,[12] he actually did what one might expect a canny Scot to do—go on with his history and mend matters as best he could.

There were three obvious things that Hume might do, and he did all three. The first was to avoid giving offense in the future wherever it might be avoided; the second was to defend, or at least plead extenuation for, what he had already written; and the third was to make less offensive, when the opportunity presented, the volume already published.

The first of these tasks was taken in hand at once. Discussing the manuscript of the second volume of the Stuart history with his new bookseller, Andrew Millar, in a letter of April 12, 1755, he wrote ruefully, "I shall give no farther Umbrage to the Godly."[13] When the second volume of the Stuart history appeared in 1757, an attentive reader might detect in it immediately a different tone. This is not to say that Hume avoided the subject of religion—that would hardly be possible in a volume dealing with the Commonwealth, the Restoration, and the Revolution—nor that he paid court to any religious faction. But it is to say that Hume minded his language very carefully; that he ceased to mock; that when he did condemn he did

so soberly and reasonably; and, above all, that he took great pains to state precisely what he meant and what he was prepared to stand by.

Hume revised his *History* tirelessly through edition after edition (dying, as Lord Monboddo wittily put it, confessing, not his sins, but his Scotticisms). The present writer, in collating this first edition of the second Stuart volume with the last edition for which Hume himself furnished the corrections, examined every passage which bore on religious matters. In only four did Hume make any change not merely stylistic. Of these four, the revised versions are more conciliatory toward religion in two instances, less conciliatory in the other two. Plainly, Hume took enormous pains when he prepared the manuscript of this second volume to let no inadvertent expression slip by to embarrass him subsequently.

Hume's second move, his comment on what he had already written in his first volume, was more complicated. First he drafted a preface which he intended to prefix to the second volume.[14] In it he defended himself, but one can read between the lines the suggestion of an apology. This is particularly true in a part of the conclusion which runs, "These hints . . . the author thought proper to suggest, with regard to the free and impartial manner in which he has treated religious controversy. As to the civil and political part of his performance, he scorns to suggest any apology. . . ."

Hume decided against printing this preface. A large part of it, however, he incorporated in a long footnote near the end of the volume for which it was intended. In the footnote version, the tone is changed; it is less one of apology, more one of extenuation. To quote an excerpt:

> This sophism, of arguing from the abuse of any thing against the use of it, is one of the grossest, and at the same time, the most common, to which men are subject. The history of all ages, and none more than that of the period, which is our subject, offers us examples of the abuse of religion; and we have not been sparing, in this volume more than in the former, to remark them: But whoever would thence draw an inference to the disadvantage of religion in general would argue very rashly and erroneously. . . . That adulterate species

> of it [religion] alone, which inflames faction, animates sedition, and prompts rebellion, distinguishes itself on the open theatre of the world, and is the great source of revolutions and public convulsions. The historian, therefore, has scarce occasion to mention any other kind of religion; and he may retain the highest regard for true piety, even while he exposes all the abuses of the false . . .
>
> It is no proof of irreligion in an historian, that he remarks some fault or imperfection in each sect of religion, which he has occasion to mention. . . . It is the business of an historian to remark these abuses of all kinds; but it belongs also to a prudent reader to confine the representations, which he meets with, to that age alone of which the author treats.[15]

Hume retained this footnote through at least two subsequent editions; later it was dropped.[16]

Hume's third step was to amend the offending Volume I of the Stuart history. He had been working on his next major project, the Tudor volumes; but before sending this manuscript to the printer he prepared a revised edition of the Stuart volumes. In fact, he did more than interrupt his work on the Tudor history. Finding that a part of the first edition of the Stuart volumes remained unsold, he agreed to assume a part of the financial loss resulting from putting out a second edition before the first had been exhausted.[17]

This second edition appeared in 1759.[18] Like the first, it was in two quarto volumes. In Volume II the changes in passages dealing with religious matters were negligible; as has been noted, only four such passages in the second Stuart volume ever received any significant revision. In Volume I, on the contrary, this writer has noted some fifty significant changes in such passages; and every one would tend to give less umbrage to the godly.

Many of these revisions are quite limited in extent. Often no more than a word is changed, but that word is enough to give a quite different cast to the passage concerned. For example, in his first edition Hume wrote that the uprising of the Scots against Charles I resulted from "religion mingling with faction" (I, 226). In the second edition this becomes instead, "fanaticism mingling with faction" (I, 216). Charles's "pious prejudices" in the 1754 volume (I, 453) become his

"religious principles" in the 1759 revision (I, 442). Yet again, the statement "James endeavored to infuse a small tincture of superstition into the national worship" (I, 63) is revised to read "James endeavored to infuse a small tincture of ceremony into the national worship" (I, 54).

Sometimes the change is the dropping out of a derogatory adjective—"fanatic," or "bigoted," or "superstitious," or an ironic "pious." Sometimes it is a matter of qualification. Where Hume first wrote that Puritan zeal promoted "each vice or corruption of mind" (I, 303), he later softened his phrasing to "many vices or corruptions of mind" (I, 292). In the 1754 edition, the famous Covenant was described as being "composed of the most furious and most virulent invectives, with which any human beings had ever inflamed their breast to an unrelenting animosity against their fellow creatures" (I, 227). In the 1759 volume the wording is much milder: the Covenant is now "composed of many invectives, fitted to inflame the minds of men against their fellow creatures, whom heaven has enjoined them to cherish and to love" (I, 217).

Sometimes changes are made to rid the text of levity. Discussing the religious usages James I had tried to impose on the Scottish churches, Hume first wrote:

> It will be sufficient to give an account of one or two of the ceremonies, which the King was so intent to establish. . . . On these occasions, history is sometimes constrained to depart a little from her native and accustomed gravity.
>
> As episcopal ordination was still wanting to the Scotch bishops, who derived their character merely from votes of parliaments and assemblies; James had called up three of them to England. By canonical ceremonies and by imposition of hands, they received from the English bishops that unknown, and therefore the more revered virtue, which, thro' innumerable prelates, had been supposed to be transmitted, without interruption, from the first disciples and apostles. And these three bishops were esteemed sufficient to preserve alive that virtue, to transport it into Scotland, and to transfer it, by their touch, to their brethren and successors in that kingdom. (I, 63-64)

Three paragraphs follow in the same jocular vein, concluding with a listing of the proposed changes in ceremony. But in the 1759 volume, Hume's archness has wholly disappeared, along with a good portion of the text:

> It will not be necessary to give a particular account of the ceremonies, which the King was so intent to establish. . . . It is here sufficient to remark, that the rites introduced by James regarded the kneeling at the sacrament, private communion, private baptism, confirmation of children, and the observance of Christmas and other festivals. These ceremonies were afterwards known by the name of the articles of Perth, from the place where they were ratified by the assembly. (I, 54-55)

There are other excisions, minor in scope, yet revealing. Hume had first written how the House of Commons in 1625 attacked a book written by one of Charles' chaplains "which, to the great disgust of the commons and all good protestants, saved virtuous catholics, as well as other christians, from eternal torments" (I, 150). The revised version (I, 140) omits the gibe at the Protestants. A second example tells even more. An original passage runs, "Had Charles been of a disposition to regard all theological controversy, as the mere result of human folly and depravity; he yet had been obliged, in good policy, to adhere to episcopal jurisdiction. . . . But Charles had never attained such enlarged principles" (I, 390). Revised, this begins, "Had Charles been of a disposition to neglect all theological controversy; he yet had been obliged, etc." (I, 380).

Most important of all were Hume's complete excisions from his text. Originally, in filling in the background for the reign of James I, he had written a lengthy "Character of the Puritans." The initial paragraph will indicate its tenor:

> The first reformers, who made such furious and successful attacks on the Romish SUPERSTITION, and shook it to its lowest foundations, may safely be pronounced to have been universally inflamed with the highest ENTHUSIASM. These two species of religion, the superstitious and fanatical, stand in diametrical opposition to each other; and a large portion of the latter must necessarily fall to his share, who is so

> couragious [sic] as to control authority, and so assuming as to obtrude his own innovations upon the world. Hence that rage of dispute, which every where seized the new religionists; that disdain of ecclesiastical subjection; that contempt of ceremonies, and of all the exterior pomp and splendor of worship. And hence, too, that inflexible intrepidity, with which they braved dangers, torments, and even death itself; while they preached the doctrine of peace, and carried the tumults of war, thro' every part of Christendom. (I, 7-8)

In the edition of 1759, the "Character of the Puritans" has disappeared entirely, and it was never reprinted. Some pages over, there is a comparable "Character of the Catholics." It, too, was omitted entirely in the revised edition. Most of Hume's readers would not be offended that he should attack Catholicism; but what good Protestant would not bristle at such sentences as the following:

> And the dreadful tribunal of the inquisition, that utmost instance of human depravity, is a durable monument to instruct us what a pitch iniquity and cruelty may rise to, when covered with the sacred mantle of religion. . . . Like all other species of superstition, it [Catholicism] rouses the vain fears of unhappy mortals; but it knows also the secret of allaying these fears, and by exterior rites, ceremonies, and abasements, tho' sometimes at the expence of morals, it reconciles the penitent to his offended deity. (I, 26-27)

A further heaping up of examples might do more to weary the flesh than to illuminate the spirit. Enough has been set forth to show what compromises and concessions Hume was willing to make when his first Stuart volume was attacked on religious grounds. First, he curbed his own pen in continuing the history, commenting wryly that he would give no further "umbrage to the godly." Second, he published a defense of his first volume, a defense that contained an implied apology, saying his readers should not infer anything to the disadvantage of "religion in general" because he had offered examples of religious *abuses*. Third, as soon as it was feasible he sent to the press a new, "corrected" edition of the Stuart history carefully revised so as to be less offensive to the pious reader. In this version

Hume abandoned the spirit of levity with which he sometimes treated religious matters; he softened expressions from their original acerbity; he excised entire passages of "editorializing" which reflected upon the sincerity of religious sects; and he maintained an historian's objectivity much more consistently than he had in the first edition.

Such knowledge of how Hume reacted when his last great work drew theological odium down upon his head may give us some clue to the nature of Hume's own religious convictions. More important, perhaps, is the knowledge that may be gained of just how far Hume would retreat under fire. Of the history, as revised, he might well have said, "Here I stand." A study of his treatment of religious matters in these volumes will not in itself solve, but will at least throw needed light upon a fascinating puzzle in Hume's character—a puzzle whose solution would aid enormously in our understanding of that philosopher.

---

[1]*The Letters of David Hume,* ed. J. Y. T. Greig (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), I, 224-225. (Hereafter cited as *Letters*)

[2]Adam Smith's letter, originally printed with Hume's *My Own Life* (London, 1777), is perhaps most easily accessible in the *Letters,* II, 450-452.

[3]*The Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle,* eds. Geoffrey Scott and F. A. Pottle (Privately printed. New York, 1928-34), XII, 228.

[4]The widely reprinted account of this dinner, originating with Diderot, is best placed in context in Ernest Campbell Mossner's *The Life of David Hume* (Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1954), p. 483.

[5]Andre Leroy, *La Critique et la Religion chez David Hume* (Paris: Felix Alcan, 1931), pp. 360ff.

[6]*The Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion,* published posthumously, apparently existed in manuscript prior to 1755. See *Hume's Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion,* ed. Norman Kemp Smith, 2nd ed. (New York: Social Science Publishers, 1948), p. v.

[7]Reprinted in *Letters,* I, 4.

[8]See, however, Mossner, "Was Hume a Tory Historian?" *JHI,* II (1941), 225-236.

[9]*Letters,* I, 4, 214. For other factors impeding the sale, see Mossner, *The Life of David Hume,* pp. 305-316.

[10]*Letters,* I, 25.

[11]Mossner, *The Life of David Hume,* pp. 323-325.

[12]*My Own Life,* in *Letters,* I, 4.

[13]*Letters,* I, 218. Hume went on to add, "Tho' I am far from thinking, that my Liberties on that head have been the real Cause of checking the Sale of the first Volume." His subsequent actions, however, reflect some doubt as to the strict accuracy of this statement.

[14]The complete text is reprinted in John Hill Burton's *Life and Correspondence of David Hume* (Edinburgh: William Tait, 1846), II, 11-13.

[15]*History of Great Britain* (London, 1757), II, 449-450. It will be noted that this becomes Volume VI when the completed work is reprinted in quarto under the title of *The History of England* in 1762, and Volumes VII and VIII in the many subsequent octavo editions.

[16]It appears in the octavo edition of 1763 (VIII, 319-320). It has disappeared by the edition of 1773. Two intervening editions have not been examined by this writer. Presumably Hume felt that his plea had lost its *raison d'etre* after wide circulation of the revised volumes of Stuart history.

[17]*Letters,* I, 281-282. A letter from Hume to Andrew Millar (*Ibid.,* p. 265) shows Hume's desire to revise the Stuart volumes as early as 1757, a few months after Volume II appeared.

[18]*The History of Great Britain Under the House of Stuart.* The second edition, corrected (London, 1759). In the following discussion of variations between the 1754 and the 1759 editions of Volume I of this history, page numbers concerned will simply be run in with the text.

Recent Interpretations of Chaucer's *Hous of Fame* and A New Suggestion

Donald C. Baker

CHAUCER'S VISION poems have, in the last several years, received increasingly scholarly and critical attention. Of these, the *Hous of Fame* and the *Parlement of Foules* have received the greater portion of explication and comment, the latter being universally approved and the former somewhat less than universally admired, and then with serious misgivings, especially concerning the structure and thematic organization of the poem. On these matters two scholars have recently turned their critical powers, one, Professor Ruggiers,[1] finding the poem unified and informed by the poet's concern for the philosophical nature of things (suggesting en route that the "man of gret auctorite" might be Boethius), and another, Professor Allen,[2] presenting convincingly the idea that the poet's concern with things of poetry is a recurring though not closely unifying motif throughout the poem. The latter suggestion, of course, is a broadened and somewhat more profound application of an old notion that the poet's search in the houses of Fame and Rumor is for new materials for poetry. Both essays are important contributions to the understanding of Chaucer's poem, although they present varying views and disagree on major points.

Without entering the lists with Professor Allen, who sees the poem as not containing that sort of unity "found in post-Renaissance poetry," whatever that means, this writer would like to add a few remarks about

the theme of the poem, and, by implication, its unity. First, this essay will suggest a common ground for the views of Chaucer as Philosopher and Chaucer as Poet in the *Hous of Fame*. This is not to imply that at long last the key to the poem's mystery has been found, but to point out a development within the poem which has been largely ignored, namely the importance for this theme of poetry of Chaucer's two great sources of imagery in the poem, Boethius and Dante. And, secondly, the paper will suggest, not the identity of the "man of gret auctorite" but rather what he might have said, whoever he was, to bring together the threads of the poem, and the possible reason for his not being allowed to speak. It is not necessary in any explication such as this to throw out of court allegorical or autobiographical implications of the poem; it is simply that they are not considered. A work of art may, indeed must, exist on a number of levels; this paper proposes re-examination of a theme which may not be the chief vehicle of meaning in the poem at all . . . but which is certainly a very important one.

This writer finds himself in general agreement with Professor Allen's delineation of the theme of art and poetry in the *Hous of Fame*.[3] Everywhere the reader turns in the poem he is met with an emphasis upon artifice, upon the artist. From the initial concern with the interpretation of dreams on through the Dido episode,[4] the poet's trip with the Eagle to gather tidings for his use as a poet, "Geffrey's" maze of adventures in the House of Fame featuring the poets, entertainers, jugglers, historians, and singers, to his final, giddy experience in the whirling House of Rumor, the emphasis is everywhere upon the poet, the poet as purveyor of fame, and upon poetic materials. Where Professor Allen goes astray is in seeing this as merely a recurring motif rather than as a theme which is carefully developed, examined, and studied by Chaucer, with more than an overtone of philosophical concern. And this is where the philosophy of the poem enters the scene. It cannot be dismissed simply by saying that Chaucer was a poet and not a philosopher. Granted, but cannot a poet be deeply concerned with a philosophical view of life? Chaucer is no Dante, true, and there is much of rich humor in the poem which interpretations of the philosophical sort tend to ignore; but, on the other hand, Chaucer is

no slapstick comedian. There is much that is deeply serious in the poem. Chaucer is in the *Hous of Fame* as elsewhere as much of a philosophical poet as England has ever had. One has only to recall the *Knight's Tale* and the *Troilus* to be aware of his concern with a philosophical view of life.

Professor Ruggiers, in a different view, sees the poem as concerned with Chaucer the man's exploration of Fame as a phenomenon in itself, and with his attempt to discover a philosophical, not to say theological, orientation of Fame and the various kinds of love in the universe. Chaucer, puzzled and uneasy about Fame in its relation to love, as exampled by the Dido episode, is carried by the Eagle to the dwelling of Fame herself for an explanation. But he finds none and goes to the House of Rumor, where Fame or Rumor and love and various other subjects are presented in their varying relations to each other. There then appears the "man of gret auctorite" who is, in Ruggiers' opinion, going to satisfy Chaucer's curiosity by relating those disparate things, those kinds of love and the functions of Fame, and place them within a universal framework. Boethius might be as good a guess as any, Ruggiers feels, and for his particular interpretation of the poem, an obvious one. This almost purely philosophical view of the poem, though valuable, ignores the theme of poetry and the difficulties of the poet, and does not sufficiently emphasize Chaucer's concern for the nature of Fame in this philosophical sense as it relates to the poet's activities.

But, striking a path somewhat between the interpretations offered by Professors Allen and Ruggiers, one arrives at a fascinating possibility. This possibility is that one important theme of the poem is Chaucer's concern for the role that the artist plays in society, in God's universe[5]—the role of the artist as purveyor of Fame, as the historian, as the spreader of rumor, the role of the artist in his multifarious activities in the social and moral structure of the medieval world, a concern which this writer has elsewhere studied at some length as occupying central positions of importance in all the vision poems.[6] It is this writer's opinion that this theme is perhaps the basic unifying theme of the poem, initiating it, providing its motivation, and bringing about, or rather failing to bring about, the poem's conclusion. In

order to develop this approach, it will first be necessary to discuss, partially, the intellectual background of the *Hous of Fame.*

Probably the two greatest informing influences upon Chaucer's thought and art at about the time that he wrote the *Hous of Fame,* whether its composition be put early or late in the decade assigned to it, were Boethius and Dante. Between them they dominate the imagery, allusion, and thought of the poem. Ruggiers successfully demonstrates Chaucer's heavy drawing upon the *Consolatio,* if not for the purpose of building the structure of the *Hous of Fame,* at least for informing much of the imagery and orienting generally the flow of ideas in the poem. Dante's influence throughout, in the Vergilian material, the Eagle, etc., is so obvious that it was once a popular idea that Chaucer was actually parodying Dante, or that he "writ Daunte in Englisshe." These two mighty influences upon later medieval literature, it should be remarked, differ radically upon one thing which is germane, in the view of this writer, to the *Hous of Fame.* They represent the polarities of medieval Christian thought, the thought of western civilization generally, upon the function of the poet, the fabler, in a moral society. Dante sees the poet as the guide, the teacher of mankind, the prophet and creator. Although this view is implied in the *Convivio* and elsewhere, it has its most impressive statement, of course, in the *Divine Comedy* itself, where, beginning with his use of Vergil as his guide through the Inferno, and culminating in the inspired sublimation of the poet's devotion to the symbolic adored, Dante pays perhaps literature's most glorious tribute to the lofty concept of the poet as seer and teacher. This view, which may loosely be called the Aristotelian view, is juxtaposed to the Platonic tradition of the *Republic,* of the poet as liar, slanderer, misleader and tempter, which is emphasized in Boethius' *Consolatio.* One particularly remembers:

> And whan she saugh thise poetical Muses/ aprochen aboute my bed and enditynge wordes/ to my wepynges, sche was a litil amoeved, and/ glowede with cruel eighen. "Who," quod sche,/ "hath suffred aprochen to this sike man thise/ comune strompettis of swich a place that men/ clepen the theatre; the whiche not oonly ne/ asswagen noght his sorwes with none

> rem-/ edies, but thei wolden fedyn and noryssen/ hym with sweete venym. For sothe thise ben/ tho that with thornes and prikkynges of talentz/ or affeccions, which that ne bien nothyng fruc-/ tifyenge nor profitable, destroyen the corn plen-/ tyvous of fruytes of resoun. For thei holden/ hertes of men in usage, but thei delyvre noght/ folk fro maladye. But yif ye Muses hadden/ withdrawen fro me with youre flateries any/ unkunnynge and unprofitable man, as men/ ben wont to fynde comonly among the pe-/ ple, I wolde wene suffre the lasse grevosly;/ forwhi, in swych an unprofitable man, myne/ ententes weren nothyng endamaged. But ye/ withdrawen me this man, that hath ben nor-/ yssed in the studies or scoles of Eleaticis and Achademycis in Grece. But goth now rather/ awey, ye mermaydenes, whiche that ben swete/ til it be at the laste, and suffreth this man/ to ben cured and heeled by myne muses/ *(that is to seyn, by noteful sciences.)*"[7]

This violent reaction on the part of the Lady Philosophy must have deeply impressed Chaucer as he translated.

It is on the continually juxtaposed imagery and allusion drawn from these two informing sources that Chaucer places much of the burden of the theme of the poet and his function in the world. A very brief review of the "theme of poetry" is necessary before conclusions can be drawn. In this, it is necessary to go quickly over ground that Allen has already covered.

The poet is involved in a quest. This quest is on the surface simply, as has often been noted, a quest for new materials for poetry. This quest, initiated by the poet's selfless service of love, soon becomes closely involved with the nature of Fame, to which the last book of the poem is devoted. The third book, while analyzing the methods of Fame, akin to those of her sisters Fortuna and Venus,[8] spends a good deal of time on the various agencies of Fame which make possible her operations. And, these agencies are, most of them, in some way or another a part of the activities of the poet.[9] But the nature of Fame is to Chaucer the poet a troublesome enigma. And that enigma lies in the fact that clearly there are two types of Fame, and the poet, willy-nilly, serves them both. The first, the grander

design, represented by Joseph, Homer, Statius, Guido, Vergil, Claudian and Lucan, is apparently noble and altogether just. The second kind of fame, merely gossip, rumor, often injurious, which Chaucer encounters in the House of Rumor, is obviously of a lower order.

The poet's disillusionment comes first in the episode of the Nine Companies of Supplicants and secondly in the House of Rumor when he finds that all fame, be it merely rumor or the noble history of a people, is ultimately fickle and unstable, parts of the same cloth. When "Geffrey" steps forward in the House of Rumor to hear what the "man of gret auctorite" has to say, he does so not simply as a character in a fantasy, or as Chaucer searching for a philosophical answer to the problems of Fame in the relation of man to the world. He does so as a poet; he was chosen for the pilgrimage as a poet, he comes, albeit unwillingly, as a poet, he is conscious throughout of his vocation (the "tydinges" are for his "lore" and "prow"), and it would seem that whatever he should learn from the mysterious man would be directed in part at least at the problems of a poet. Whatever the man might have revealed to the poet, and many things have been suggested, would a further suggestion be out of place, that it might have been, implicitly or explicitly, a justification for the poet and his function as agent of Fame?

Professor Allen does not link the message of the mysterious man to this theme. He sees the theme of the poet concluded in the House of Rumor when Chaucer learns of the fickleness of Fame, which "relieves him of responsibility for the behavior of his characters and the moral impression they make upon his readers."[10] Professor Allen then points to the *Prologue* of the *Legend of Good Women* and to the conclusion of *Troilus* as further evidence of Chaucer's conviction. However, one recalls how much Chaucer is interested in the subject, the pains which he takes in the *Legend* and elsewhere, particularly in the *General Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales,* to relieve the artist of such responsibility. Such reiterated statements do not reassure. He seems to protest too much. And there is the ultimate failure of such "conviction." However one wishes to take the *Retraction,* it is there. His love of his art and his deep concern for the larger implications are always present. This is no attempt to melodramatize Chaucer's strug-

gles, but merely a statement that the tension exists in his work. Particularly does it exist in the *Hous of Fame*. Professor Allen must, too, feel this tension or he would not have perceived the theme of art in this context. The *Hous of Fame* is a poem filled with Chaucer's reading, his reading and his thinking. He has just been dipping deeply into the Italian springs, especially Dante and Boethius. Involved as he is with the concept of the function of the poet, and fresh from his reading of these masters with their opposing attitudes on the subject, it seems unlikely that the climax of the poem would have been unrelated to this theme. It seems unlikely that he would abandon this theme immediately before the appearance of the "man of gret auctorite." And herein lies the suggestion of this paper as to why Chaucer's poem is unfinished. The suggestion is that Chaucer intended for the mysterious man to have something to say, with whatever else he might have said, touching the responsibility of a poet in society. The tensions within the poem, perhaps represented by the echoes of Dante on the one hand and those of Boethius on the other, were irreconcilable for Chaucer, and since he was unable to come to a satisfactory resolution in his own mind for this theme, decided not to attempt to conclude the poem on the other levels of meaning as well. Whoever the "man of gret auctorite" was, whether he was in fact to have been any individual, is a problem not to be solved by this suggestion.[11] But in this respect it is certainly not inferior to others. The theme of the poem as sketched in this paper, and the failure of its resolution, is, this writer believes, revealed further in the perception of another poet in another society, but, with all poets, concerned with the same problems. Alexander Pope concludes his often-scoffed-at imitation of Chaucer's poem, "The Temple of Fame," in this way:

> Oh! if the Muse must flatter lawless sway,
> And follow still where fortune leads the way;
> Or if no basis bear my rising name,
> But the fall'n ruins of another's fame;
> Then teach me, Heav'n! to scorn the guilty bays;
> Drive from my breast that wretched lust of praise;
> Unblemish'd let me live or die unknown;
> Oh, grant an honest fame, or grant me none![12]

[1]Paul G. Ruggiers, "The Unity of Chaucer's *House of Fame*," *SP*, L (January, 1953), 16-29.

[2]Robert J. Allen, "A Recurring Motif in Chaucer's 'House of Fame,'" *JEGP*, LV (July, 1956), 393-405. For the purposes of this paper, it will be assumed that Allen's theory of the "recurring motif" of poetry is successfully demonstrated. Otherwise, this paper would be twice as long.

[3]Though he most emphatically does not agree with Allen's interpretation that Chaucer's fears regarding the moral responsibility of the poet are relieved by his discovering the nature of Fame, Chaucer would very likely have desired such a reassurance, but could not justify it, particularly in light of his retraction and numerous similar statements.

[4]It is, of course, the Dido episode which most clearly proposes the problem of the poet in relation to Fame, in Dido's lament (ll. 345-360). All references to Chaucer are to *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1957).

[5]Professor Allen treats this only incidentally in summarizing a number of implications in his conclusion, 404.

[6]"Symbol and Theme in Chaucer's Vision Poems," unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Oklahoma, 1954) and "The Dreamer Again in the *Book of the Duchess*," *PMLA*, LXX (March, 1955), 279-282.

[7]Chaucer's translation, Robinson, p. 321.

[8]The conflation of these three figures in medieval thought has strong implications for the poet, who is a servant of all three. This aspect of the three figures is stressed by Ruggiers (18-19), and studied exhaustively by H. R. Patch, *The Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), *passim*.

[9]This is stressed throughout Allen's article, especially pp. 402-403.

[10]Allen, p. 404.

[11]This is not to say, however, that the interpretation of the poem in this paper does not suggest a candidate. The writer's "hunch" is that the "man of gret auctorite" might well have been Vergil. Since Vergil provided, in the Dido episode, the point of departure for Chaucer's journey (as he had done for Dante), it seems not improbable that he might have been chosen to weave together the various threads of the poem, had Chaucer been able to reconcile his thematic opposites. This suggestion, of course, is not new.

[12]*The Complete Poetical Works of Pope*, ed. H. W. Boynton (Boston, 1931), p. 59.

Tennysonian Aspects of *Maud*

Tom J. Truss, Jr.

STUDIES OF Tennyson's *Maud* depend generally upon three considerations: the psychological analysis of the hero, the public reaction to the poem itself, and the classification of the poem in the tradition of the Spasmodics, and hence in the Victorian school of Byron.[1] The Tennysonian qualities of *Maud* have been somewhat obscured or overlooked by these studies, and the poem stands almost as a unique excursion into a realm never before and never again entered by the laureate. Actually the difference between *Maud* and Tennyson's other poetry is not vast. In this "unique" instance, Tennyson merely communicated his ideas in a dramatic rather than a customary lyric or idyllic form.

I

Central to an understanding of the monodrama is the meaning which one should give the lyric beginning "Come into the garden, Maud" (Pt. I, xxii). Professor E. D. H. Johnson has pointed out the significance of the *rose*-symbol of this lyric to the structural unity of the whole cycle.[2] More can be said on the subject if one looks for uses of the *rose*-image elsewhere. Like *Maud,* "The Gardener's Daughter" is a love poem; but quite different from *Maud,* the story has a harmonious, happy ending, even though the beloved one is lost.

Tennyson significantly named the heroine of this poem "Rose," and placed her home in a large and sumptuous garden. The symbol (a "Rose / In roses," ll. 141-142) which she depicts connotes voluptuousness:

> The common mouth,
> So gross to express delight, in praise of her
> Grew oratory. (ll. 54-56)

In fact, one detects something of the Aphrodite of "Oenone" in the speaker's first view of Rose:

> Holding the bush, to fix it back, she stood,
> A single stream of all her soft brown hair
> Pour'd on one side; the shadow of the flowers
> Stole all the golden gloss, and, wavering
> Lovingly lower, trembled on her waist. . . .
> The full day dwelt on her brows, and sunn'd
> Her violet eyes, and all her Hebe bloom,
> And doubled his own warmth against her lips,
> And on the bounteous wave of such a breast
> As never pencil drew. Half light, half shade,
> She stood, a sight to make an old man young.[3]

Such a delight was she, according to the speaker, that "henceforward squall nor storm / Could keep me from that Eden where she dwelt" (ll. 186-187). The hero of this poem was saved from the fate of Maud's lover probably because his intentions were honorable:

> And while I mused, Love with knit brows went by,
> And with a flying finger swept my lips,
> And spake, 'Be wise: not easily forgiven
> Are those who, setting wide the doors that bar
> The secret bridal chambers of the heart,
> Let in the day.' (ll. 240-245)

The hero of *Maud* was not so cautious.

Similar use of the *rose*-image is found in "Balin and Balan." In a discussion of the comparative merits of lilies and roses, representations respectively of purity and sensuality, Guinevere said to Lancelot, "Sweeter to me . . . this garden rose / Deep-hued and many-folded!" (ll. 264-265). Confused by this conversation and the activity it alluded to, the youthful and impetuous Balin became distraught by the intoxicating song of the wily Vivien:

Old priest, who mumble worship in your quire—
Old monk and nun, ye scorn the world's desire,
Yet in your frosty cells ye feel the fire!
The fire of heaven is not the flame of hell. (ll. 438-441)

The seductress Vivien here symbolically anticipates the cause for the decay of Arthur's kingdom. Introduced rather early in the *Idylls* (in the fourth poem as the series was finally arranged), she displayed herself as a *femme fatale* in the fifth poem, "Merlin and Vivien",[4] and paved the way thematically for "Lancelot and Elaine." The lily-, and hence pure, maid of Astolat succumbed to an idle and unwarrantable passion for Arthur's chief knight, Guinevere's lover, and in so doing mysteriously met her death. Thus ideas in *Maud* (1855) appeared again in "Merlin and Nimue," begun in February, 1856.[5] With its name changed to "Vivien" the poem appeared in a cycle of four *Idylls,* which also included "Elaine," in 1859. Tennyson used the *lily-* and *rose-*images again in "The Ancient Sage" (1885). In verses substantially resembling passages in "The Vision of Sin," the youthful poet complained with Omarian cynicism:

The years that when my youth began
Had set the lily and the rose
By all my ways where'er they ran,
Have ended mortal foes;
My rose of love forever gone,
My lily of truth and trust—
They made her lily and rose in one,
And changed her into dust. (ll. 155-162)

A major concern of Tennyson in *Maud,* then, is the development of a man's preoccupation with voluptuousness and the results of this preoccupation. One does not have to look far to find parallels. In "Oenone" the "beautiful Paris, the evil-hearted Paris," with his sunny hair clustered about his temple like a God's, chose the bribe of Aphrodite, who "with a subtle smile in her mild eyes" promised the "fairest and most loving wife in Greece" (ll. 180-183); the poet of *In Memoriam* urged,

Arise and fly
The reeling Faun, the sensual feast;
Move upward, working out the beast. (cxviii, ll. 25-27)

And much later the Ancient Sage advised the poetic youth, "Curb the beast would cast thee in the mire" (l. 276).

The invitation at the gate, "Come into the garden, Maud," indeed recalls the sensual imagery of "The Gardener's Daughter," the denouement of Lancelot's unwitting enchantment of Elaine, and many other similar parallels.[6] The line "The planet of Love is on high" (l. 8 of this lyric) is furthermore an obvious veiled reference to the concept of Aphrodite which informs "Oenone." The lover, one also remembers, once stood by Maud's garden gate, where a lion, clasped by a passion-flower, ramped at the top (Pt. I, ll. 495-496). In fact, just before the conclusion of the invitational lyric, the hero refers again to the passion-flower (ll. 908-909). The predicament here certainly smacks of Betty Miller's thesis: "at no time was a man in greater jeopardy than at the moment of sexual union with the woman of his choice."[7]

The life of contemplation is another of the hero's preoccupations. Shortly after Maud's appearance at the estate, when the hero is deciding to retreat further into himself, he smiles a "hard-set smile, like a stoic, or like / A wiser epicurean" (ll. 121-122), and resolves:

> Be mine a philosopher's life in the quiet woodland ways,
> Where if I cannot be gay let a passionless peace be my lot,
> Far-off from the clamor of liars belied in the hubbub of lies.
> (ll. 150-153)

The hero's contempt for his fellow men and retreat from them significantly resemble the Soul's reflection in "The Palace of Art":

> O Godlike isolation which art mine,
> I can but count thee perfect gain,
> What times I watch the darkening droves of swine
> That range on yonder plain.
> . . . . . .
> I sit as God holding no form of creed,
> But contemplating all. (ll. 197-212)

Furthermore, the reference to the "wiser epicurean" and the passages which follow call upon the reader's knowledge of Lucretius and the monologue Tennyson gave to him. Eternal calm, the Victorian Lucretius claims, is the center of the life which the greatest people follow (ll. 78-79); and he addresses the object of his search as "passionless

bride, divine Tranquillity" (l. 265). An important theme of Lucretius derives from the speaker's final question, "What is duty?" His bewilderment and consequent suicide stem from his having omitted this question from his inquiry. In the opening poem of *Maud,* the youthful hero is preparing for himself the same fate which befell the Soul in "The Palace of Art" and, later, the philosopher Lucretius. By having the hero go to war at the conclusion of the poems, Tennyson averted a catastrophe deriving from a Lucretian psychosis. This pattern is parallel to the resolve in *In Memoriam,* "I will not shut me from my kind," and the less personal affirmation, "Merit lives from man to man, / And not from man, O Lord, to thee."[8]

Thus two important themes in Tennyson, the dilemmas posed by sensuality and by intellectual and social isolation, appear in *Maud,* and in fact, are fused in a single dramatic situation. Significantly the speaker in "Locksley Hall" is concerned with the same problems. He wishes momentarily to escape to the East (*i.e.,* to live a sensual life), for there he will find more enjoyment than in the thoughts that shake mankind; but like Maud's lover, who entered the military, he soon mixes himself with action to keep from withering by despair.

II

The metrics of *Maud* similarly parallel Tennyson's craft elsewhere.

The first lyric (Pt. I, i) is composed of ponderous, slowly moving hexameters, the feet of which contain a primitive arsis-thesis rise and fall. The lines show no courtly polish, and unfold with an uncivilized, frenzied force.[9] A deliberate monotony is afforded by the stanza-form itself. The rhyme scheme $abab_6$ gives a sense of regularity, and the distance between the rhyming words produces an effect of slowness. Metrically, the opening poem of *Maud* is well suited to the sustained raillery of a deranged person. Similar metrical effects exist in "Rizpah," "The Wreck," and "Despair." In "Rizpah," a crazed old crone holds the ear of a sympathetic listener to rail, like Maud's lover, in frenzied hexameters, against what in the mind of the speaker constitutes injustices. Her son was hanged for robbing the mail, she complains, and his corpse was left to rot, as an example to passers-by.

In "The Wreck," a faithless wife bemoans her tragic mistake. She deserted her husband and daughter for a dazzling newcomer to her circle. "I bow'd myself down as a slave to his intellectual throne" (l. 66). "I would hide," she wails in summing up her folly—"I would hide from the storm without, I would flee from the storm within" (l. 9). In "Despair," an infidel, just rescued from a double suicide with his wife (who was successful), laments, in frenzied hexameters, the criminality of his older son, the disappearance of another son, and the death of an infant daughter. Religious creeds, he complains, have become obsolete. Except for the couplet rhyme, one might place this passage in *Maud:*

> What! I should call on that Infinite Love that has served us so well?
> Infinite cruelty rather that made everlasting hell,
> Made us, foreknew us, foredoom'd us, and does what he will with his own;
> Better our dead brute mother who never has heard us groan! (xvii)

In *Maud* the hero is shaken by the sight of the heroine (Pt. I, ii-iii) from this habit of railing and raving in an orderly manner. The rhyme schemes here are complex: *ababcdcedec*$_6$ and *ababcdbcd bdebe*$_6$. But he soon returns to his former self. In fact, something has come into his life which in retrospect makes him more morbid than before. According to Tennyson, he is in "a mood of bitterness after fancied disdain."[10] The monotony and ponderousness effected by the scheme *abab*$_6$ are intensified by the scheme *abcabc*$_6$ (iv). These philippics soon give way, however, to an expression of the hero's growing love for Maud and his reluctance to allow it to develop (v, vi). The drumming hexameters are abandoned for a shorter verse form. The rhyme schemes have a great number of interlocked rhymes, and Tennyson exercises considerable freedom with line-lengths. Thus the morbid and misanthropic youth who habitually railed in hexameters at things in general came to express spontaneously his new interest in Maud in three-, four-, and five-foot lines irregularly arranged and irregularly rhymed. The versification here reflects the novelty of the situation and the spontaneity of the speaker's utter-

ances. A similar shift in metrics, only in reverse, exists in the Choric Song of "The Lotus-Eaters." The victims of the blossom fall asleep metrically as well as psychically. The patterning of the opening stanza is more irregular than that of the concluding stanza (the eighth): (i) *ababcc*$_5$*c*$_6$ *d*$_3$*d*$_4$*d*$_5$*d*$_6$ and (viii) *aa bb*$_5$*b*$_8$ *c*$_7$*cc*$_8$ *ddd*$_7$ *e*$_7$*e*$_8$*e f*$_7$*ff gg*$_8$*g hhh*$_7$ *ii*$_8$*i jjj*$_7$. Tennyson anticipates in stanza i the triplet rhymes of stanza viii with a languorous repetition of *d*-rhymes and with a methodical lengthening of successive *d*-rhyme lines; and the poem finally settles in conclusion into an almost regular heptameter. In fact, a final and completely regular pattern of triplet heptameters, into which the passage might have moved had it been continued, is suggested by the *d*-, *h*-, and *j*-rhyme triplets. The distance between *h* and *j* is shorter than that between *d* and *h*. Although the 1832 version of the poem is quite different from this, its revised form, one can detect in it an early attempt of Tennyson to induce sleep metrically. The trimeter lines, with their truncated feet, make the rhyming heptameters, which immediately follow, sound unfortunately like ballad stanzas:

> Hark! how sweet the horned ewes bleat
> On the solitary steeps,
> And the merry lizard leaps,
> And the foamwhite waters pour;
> And the dark pine weeps,
> And the lithe vine creeps,
> And the heavy melon sleeps
> On the level of the shore:
> Oh! islanders of Ithaca, we will not wander more.
> Surely, surely slumber is more sweet than toil, the shore
> Than labour in the ocean, and rowing with the oar.
> Oh! islanders of Ithaca, we will return no more. (p. 805)

What Tennyson was working for in this 1832 version is clear, but he was considerably more successful in the 1842 publication. One can thus detect in the different versions of "The Lotus-Eaters" the development of the craft which appears in *Maud*. In the Choric Song the men cease to sing in rather irregular free verse as they sink sleepily into the routine and monotony of the form *aaabbbccc*$_7$, etc.; and the hero of *Maud,* shaken from the routine of his regular scheme

abcabc$_6$ by the heroine's voice and later by a conversation with her, begins a discourse in free verse (v-vi).

Next follows a poem of a remembered conversation between the hero's and Maud's fathers, both now deceased (vii). The speaker's chaotic reflections yield here to reminiscences of a childhood incident, and the verse-scheme is regular and symmetrical. The hero is not thrust into a new situation, as in the free-verse stanzas; and the passage does not hint at the hexameters at the beginning of the poem. The thoughts expressed in these simple, regular lines were planted in the speaker's mind long before the cause of the raillery of the opening sections of the cycle appeared in the hero's world. Metrically this poem delineates with a childish simplicity the pre-psychotic character of the speaker. The form, trimeter quatrains with alternating rhymes, is rare in Tennyson. Perhaps significantly, a poem entitled "Memory," which appeared in *Poems by Two Brothers,* is written in trimeter quatrains with alternating rhymes.[11]

The patterns of versification in sections viii, ix, and x do not fall into any single rigid classification. They are, in fact, transitional patterns, which reflect the hero's shift from harangues in hexameters to passionate outbursts in regularly ordered lyrics. In viii and ix, the hero speaks in rather simple, direct narrative discourse. He does not rail, as he did in the opening hexameters, or on the other hand, flutter, as he did in sections v and vi. Nor does he speak in the regular pre-psychotic stanza-form of the poem of memory. The irregularity here is a middle ground between the extremes of sections v and vi on the one hand and sections i or iv on the other.

The versification of section xi is significant. Apart from the poem of reminiscence, this is the first regular lyrical expression in the monologue. Its subject matter and its regular metrics anticipate the rapture of xxii ("Come into the garden, Maud") and also the hero's imminent madness: "What matter if I go mad, / I shall have had my day." Thus when the hero considers the hope of a successful invitation of Maud to the garden, Tennyson gives to his discourse a sustained resonance and intensity. This pattern is continued in the following poem (xii), in which Tennyson uses the verse-form of the poem of

memory. The betrothal referred to there (vii) now ceases to seem a dream and almost become a reality.

From these observations on the metrics of the opening poems in *Maud,* classifications can be established to which all the lyrics in the cycle can be assigned. First are two types of regular lyrics: (1) those spoken by a misanthropic youth desiring to escape from a world he finds insufferable, and (2) those spoken by an impassioned would-be voluptuary. The harsh, grotesque tone of the first type is created by a primitive arsis-thesis foot, and the rapturous tone of the second is a result of balance, antithesis, and climax, both metrically and rhetorically—as, for example, in the speaker's statements to the flowers and the flowers' dialogue with each other (Pt. I, xxii, "Come into the garden, Maud"). Last are the irregular lyrics. In general Tennyson uses them to depict various moods as the hero alternates between ordered harangues and regularly ordered raptures. They are thus transitional poems, dramatically and metrically. In one instance, a transitional lyric might adumbrate the harsh group, as in the first stanza of Pt. I, x, where the hero catches sight of a rival suitor. In another, it might adumbrate the rhapsodic group, as in Pt. I, xviii, where the hero rejoices in the prospects of his love.[12] In the last stanza here, a lyric regularity almost emerges in *terza rima: aba cbc bab cac ada cdc ada* dd_5 a_3. One easily finds elsewhere in Tennyson such instances of voluptuousness in free verse. Expressions metrically and rhetorically resemble the poems of this class in *Maud.* "The Sea-Fairies," "The Merman," and "The Mermaid"[13] all revel in lush, sensual imagery:

> We will kiss sweet kisses, and speak sweet words;
> O, listen, listen, your eyes shall glisten
> With pleasure and love and jubilee. ("Sea-Fairies," ll. 34-36)

> But at night I would roam abroad and play
> With the mermaids in and out of the rocks,
> Dressing their hair with the white sea-flower;
> And holding them back by their flowing locks
> I would kiss them often under the sea. ("Merman," ll. 11-15)

The irregular lyrics, regardless of subclass, consistently divulge the hero's anxieties; and in general, the greater the anxiety of a given

moment, the greater the irregularity of the metrics. The passage divulging the greatest anxiety depicts the hero's concern for his corpse, in the madhouse poem (Pt. II, v). As one might expect, it is the most irregular poem in the cycle. The metrics of Part III are also easily submitted to this analysis. The mind presumably restored to sanity[14] expresses its thoughts in routine pentameter lines, but the rhyme scheme, which has no orderly pattern, reflects the fragmentary nature of the restoration.

III

Maud, furthermore, is typical of Tennyson's moralistic poetry. Submerged beneath the exterior of dramatic discourse are the messages of "Locksley Hall," "The Vision of Sin," "Oenone," and even *In Memoriam.* The young man obviously lacked "self-reverence, self-knowledge, and self-control," and Tennyson wanted to dramatize the sad consequences. In the original version Tennyson made no reference to what ultimately happened to Maud. He was concerned instead with the effect of certain values—or perhaps, their absence—on the behavior of a young man; and having given the girl psychic relevance to him, Tennyson dismissed her from the story after the duel. The situation in "Locksley Hall" is amazingly similar. Amy's lover stands as a symbol for the young man besieged with the dilemmas and anxieties of the early 1840's. In fact, the didactic symbols in "Locksley Hall"—the East, social caste, Locksley Hall itself, the rail-train ringing down its grooves—anticipate a technique used in *Maud.* The later poem has its symbolic aspects, but the flashy dramatic portrayal overshadows the message embodied in its symbols.

What, then, is the message of *Maud?* Tennyson is concerned here, as elsewhere, with the meaning of love; and just as the speaker's sensitiveness and impetuousness in "Locksley Hall" invigorate the symbolic search for values, the psychosis of Maud's lover intensifies a major theme. Throughout Tennyson, a distinction must be made between pure and impure love, and this approach is particularly useful here. One sees a great difference between the love depicted in "The Miller's Daughter" and "The Gardener's Daughter" and the love

depicted in "Sir Lancelot and Queen Guinevere" and *Maud*. A warmth of kindness and sympathy radiates from the love in "The Miller's Daughter," even though it contains a lyric suggestive of "Come into the garden, Maud":

> And I would be the necklace,
> And all day long to fall and rise
> Upon her balmy bosom,
> With her laughter or her sighs;
> And I would lie so light, so light,
> I scarce should be unclasped at night. (ll. 181-186)

Actually, the speaker is no monomaniac in regard to the physical aspects of love. The relation between the lovers deepens the meaning of the world around the young man—in short, makes him mature:

> For I was alter'd, and began
> To move about the house with joy,
> And with the certain step of man.
>
> I loved the brimming wave that swam
> Thro' quiet meadows round the mill,
> The sleepy pool above the dam,
> The pool beneath it never still,
> The meal-sacks on the whiten'd floor,
> The dark round of the dripping wheel,
> The very air about the door
> Made misty with the floating meal. (ll. 94-104)

The love depicted in "The Gardener's Daughter" is quite similar. In its suppressed prologue, the speaker all but deifies Rose: he blesses

> The All-perfect Framer, Him, who made the heart,
> Forethinking its twinfold necessity,
> Thro' one whole life an overflowing urn,
> Capacious both of Friendship and of Love.[15]

Maud's lover, on the other hand, would have succumbed to Guinevere's charms:

> As she fled fast thro' sun and shade,
> The happy winds upon her play'd,
> Blowing the ringlet from the braid.
> She look'd so lovely, as she sway'd
> The rein with dainty finger-tips,
> A man had given all other bliss,

And all his worldly worth for this,
To waste his whole heart in one kiss
Upon her perfect lips. (ll. 37-45)

This kind of relation does not beget the herald of a higher race. The love defined in the exciting and resounding epithalamion of *In Memoriam* bears fruit in the spiritual advancement of generations to come. The physical aspects are its divinely ordained means.[16] *Maud* is a shocking demonstration of the opposite kind of love, lust—the bestiality at the root of the collapse of Arthur's kingdom.[17]

The war which the lover marches off to, regardless of the ennobling reasons he gives for his act, is a semi-symbolic war. The imagery of the ending before the six-line tag was added to the 1856 version connotes a chaos like the one resulting from Paris's unwise choice in "Oenone." "All earth and air seem only burning fire" is the conclusion in the earlier instance; and in the later, everywhere "flames the blood-red blossom of war with a heart of fire." Tennyson's original intent, apparently, was to end with an image of cataclysmic destruction. In "Oenone" and *Maud* the speakers tellingly foresee a collapse of order. Arthur's kingdom had a similar fate—and for similar causes.

The 1856 ending slightly obscures but hardly abolishes the original intent. The tagged moral actually becomes ironic, and the speaker appears as a pitiful and deluded patriot. Here and throughout the poem Tennyson was perhaps sounding a warning, which should have informed for his readers the grim horror of "The Charge of the Light Brigade"—particularly its rather empty, conventional, ineffectual conclusion. Probably because his readers failed to understand *Maud,* Tennyson abandoned its mode of discourse. The styles and themes of the poem are nevertheless characteristic of the laureate; the *genre* is not.

[1]These approaches are exemplified respectively by Roy P. Basler, "Tennyson the Psychologist," *SAQ,* XLIII (1944), 143-159; Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., "The Critical Reception of Tennyson's 'Maud,'" *PMLA,* LXVIII (1953), 397-417; and Jerome H. Buckley, "The Spasmodic School," in *The Victorian Temper* (London, 1952), pp. 41-65.

[2]"The Lily and the Rose: Symbolic Meaning in Tennyson's *Maud,*" *PMLA,* LXIV (1949), 1222-1227.

[3]I use the text of the one-volume Cambridge Edition, *Complete Poetical Works,* ed. W. J. Rolfe (Boston, 1898), throughout the paper. About this passage (ll. 126-140),

Tennyson himself said: "The center of the poem . . . must be full and rich"—Hallam Tennyson, *Memoir* (London, 1897), I, 197.

[4]Evidence for this assertion is in Clyde de L. Ryals, "The 'Fatal Woman' Symbol in Tennyson," *PMLA,* LXXIV (1959), 438-443.

[5]*Memoir,* I, 414. Tennyson was apparently revising *Maud* at this time also. A second edition appeared in 1856.

[6]A. C. Swinburne recognized the laureate's intent. In his parody of the invitation, he begs a girl named Anne to come into the orchard, for "the musk of the roses perplexes a man"—*Works* (Bonchurch Edition, London, 1925), V, 291.

[7]"Tennyson and the Sinful Queen," *TC,* CLVIII (1955), 363.

[8]Lyric cviii and proem, ll. 35-36. The importance of similar themes in *Maud* and *In Memoriam* was first made clear to me by Professor Buckley.

[9]"The inherent horror of the theme is most skillfully presented by the disturbing effect of the meter," according to Robert James Mann, *Tennyson's "Maud" Vindicated* (London [1856])—(2nd ed.), p. 13. The possibility of a meaningful analysis of the versification of *Maud* was suggested by this rather overlooked study, written by a practicing physician soon after the poem appeared. According to Mann's general thesis, the "syllables and lines of the several stanzas actually trip and halt with abrupt fervour, tremble with passion, swell with emotion, and dance with joy, as each separate phase of mental experience comes on the scene" (p. 9).

[10]*Memoir,* I, 402.

[11]See *Poetical Works* (appendix), p. 755.

[12]According to Mann, these stanzas "are exquisite, beyond all things, in tenderness of sentiment, in combined force and grace of diction, and in that variation of rhythmical flow which swells and contracts, like the rise and fall of a melody, issuing from the living strings of a passionate human heart" (p. 50).

[13]Here Tennyson "turned up something which looks a good deal like adolescent sexual fantasy"—Robert Preyer, "Tennyson as an Oracular Poet," *MP,* LV (1958), 248.

[14]"Sane but shattered," Tennyson relates (*Memoir,* I, 405). See also Basler, p. 154.

[15]*Memoir,* I, 200.

[16]A knowledge of Cynthia and classical mythology emerges here. Tennyson, I feel certain, associated purity and chastity with the moon that illuminated the honeymoon cottage (ll. 109-121).

[17]See Edward Engelberg, "The Beast Image in Tennyson's *Idylls of the King,*" *ELH,* XXII (1955), 287-292.

Shakespeare And The Holy Rosary

Allen Cabaniss

To a person interested in study of the Christian liturgy, its history, practice, influence, and derivatives, perception of a liturgical allusion is sometimes the reward of conscious search, as, for example, in considering the Apocalypse or Pliny the Younger's celebrated letter to Emperor Trajan. More frequently it has been an accidental result of reading with another purpose in mind, as, for instance, while perusing the *Satiricon* of Petronius or *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius or the Anglo-Saxon epic, *Beowulf*.[2] In much the same manner there has arisen a suspicion that in the Shakespearean sonnets a subtle reflection of the liturgy may be discerned. To an investigation of that supposition I now turn.

Once the possibility of an association between Shakespeare's sonnets and a part of the liturgy or a derivative of it arises, an initial inspection reveals a certain resemblance between the structure of the poems and the Holy Rosary. From mid-sixteenth century onward the Rosary has consisted of one hundred fifty-three Hail Marys divided into fifteen groups of ten and one of three, each group now introduced by Our Father and concluded by Gloria Patri. It is quite impressive therefore to observe that there are one hundred fifty-four sonnets in the Shakespearean sequence, the last two being variants of the same theme. A second datum of some importance is the prominence of the word *rose* in the Sonnets.[3] That word is intimately

related to the term *rosary* and is employed in at least one instance in medieval literature to mean the Rosary of Christian devotion.[4] These two rather obvious points, however, prove nothing; they merely emphasize the suspicion which requires still further inquiry.

Since the fifteenth century each decade of the Rosary has been devoted to a meditation on one of the fifteen "mysteries" in the life of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary. They are *The Joyful Mysteries* — (1) The Incarnation or annunciation of the Incarnation, (2) The Blessed Virgin's visit to her cousin Elizabeth, (3) The birth or nativity of Christ, (4) The purification of the Blessed Virgin, (5) Christ lost and found at the age of twelve or the finding of Christ in the Temple among the doctors; *The Sorrowful Mysteries* — (6) Christ's agony in Gethsemane, (7) His flagellation, (8) His being crowned with thorns, (9) His carrying the cross, (10) The crucifixion; *The Glorious Mysteries* — (11) The resurrection of Christ, (12) His ascension into heaven, (13) The coming of the Holy Ghost, (14) The assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven, and (15) Her coronation.

We may quickly test our theory about the sonnets by selecting fifteen poems at intervals of ten to determine whether they bear any resemblance to the fifteen mysteries. In order not to be too arbitrary I chose as the starting-point Sonnet VII. (1) Of the first ten poems it conveys the strongest and clearest reminiscences of the Joyful Mystery of the Incarnation. As one reads lines 1-8, he inevitably recalls Psalm 18:6f. (Vulgate): "In sole posuit tabernaculum suum; et ipse tanquam sponsus procedens de thalamo suo. Exsultavit ut gigas ad currendam viam; a summo caelo egressio ejus. Et occursus ejus usque ad summum ejus; nec et qui se abscondat a calore ejus."[5] Parts of this passage occur as the antiphon on Magnificat at First Vespers of Christmas, as one of the antiphons in the first Nocturn of Matins of Christmas and Matins of the Octave of Christmas, and as the versicle and response at the end of that Nocturn on both Christmas and Christmas Octave. Under these circumstances the word *Orient* in line 1 of Sonnet VII recalls the Great Advent Antiphon, "O Oriens, splendor lucis aeternae, et sol justitiae . . . ," proper to Magnificat on December 21. In view of the foregoing parallels we

can quite justifiably state that verbally Sonnet VII may have some relation, however remote, to the first Joyful Mystery. It is therefore a convenient point of departure from which to begin a cursory inspection of the poems at intervals of ten.

(2) At first glance Sonnet XVII seems to reflect nothing of the second Joyful Mystery. Yet, strangely enough, the phrases, "in time to come" (line 1) and "The age to come" (line 7), make one think of the words, "ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes,"[6] and "a progenie in progenies,"[7] in the hymn of the Blessed Virgin. Still further, the references to poetry, "my verse" (line 1), "fresh numbers" (line 6), and "stretched miter of an Antique song" (line 12), remind us that the larger part of the Biblical narrative of the visitation is taken up with a typical Scriptural poem composed by the Blessed Virgin. Line 8, "Such heauenly touches nere toucht earthly faces," is certainly apt, and so is line 13, "But were some childe of yours aliue that time."

(3) Sonnet XXVII contains some words which might be faint allusions to the Joyful Mystery of the Nativity. The references to "my bed" (line 1) and "trauaill tired" (line 2) are surely not inappropriate,[8] and "a zelous pilgrimage to thee" (line 6) might summon up remembrance of two pilgrimages to the new-born Messiah, that of the shepherds and that of the Magi. But, above all, lines 11f, "like a jewell (hunge in gastly night) / Makes black night beautious," recalls a typical medieval conceit that the birth of Christ caused the night in which He was born to shine with preternatural light.[9]

(4) Lines 11f. of Sonnet XXXVII, "That I in thy abundance am suffic'd, / And by a part of all thy glory liue . . . ," an expression of intimate union of the poet and the person to whom the poem was addressed, suggest a phrase and an idea from the Gospel account of the fourth Joyful Mystery. The aged prophet Simeon, speaking to the Blessed Virgin, assures her that her indissoluble union with her Divine Son will mean that whatever happens to Him will happen also to her, "et tuam ipsius animam pertransibit gladius."[10] This thought and virtually these words reappear in the first stanza of the great medieval hymn, *Stabat Mater dolorosa.*

(5) The fifth Joyful Mystery is reflected throughout Sonnet

XLVII by the suggestion of separation of the poet from the person to whom the poem was written, by the poet's longing for reunion, and by the anticipation of joy at reunion.

(6) Sonnet LVII is an excellent allusion to the first Sorrowful Mystery. Christ bade His disciples to wait and watch while He went farther to pray.[11] The entire Sonnet is one about the waiting and watching of a slave who does the master's bidding without understanding it. Especially impressive is line 5, "Nor dare I chide the world-without end houre," containing that phrase with which English liturgical prayers close ("world without end"), immediately evoking the thought of prayer. The word *houre* is also quite Scriptural in this context.[12]

(7) The flagellation (the second Sorrowful Mystery) is intimated by the phrases of Sonnet LXVII, "with his presence grace impietie" (line 2), "Why should he live, now nature banckrout is, / Beggerd of blood . . ." (lines 9f.), and "before these last [daies]so bad" (line 14).

(8) Lines 5-8 of Sonnet LXXVII may be vaguely suggestive of the suffering endured from the crowning with thorns (the third Sorrowful Mystery).

(9) On the other hand, Sonnet LXXXVII in its entirety is a beautiful expression of what one might feel in the presence of the fourth Sorrowful Mystery. The first line, "Farewell thou art too deare for my possessing," is eminently apt, but especially so are lines 5f., "For how do I hold thee but by thy granting, / And for that ritches where is my deserving?" as well as the phrase in line 9, "Thy selfe thou gau'st."

(10) In a similar manner Sonnet XCVII is the sad reaction of one to the absence of his beloved, parallel to the grief of the disciples at the crucifixion (the fifth Sorrowful Mystery). Particularly apt are the words, "dark daies" (line 3), "old Decembers barenesse euery where" (line 4), and "thou away, the very birds are mute" (line 12).

(11) The parallels in Sonnet CVII to the first Glorious Mystery are unusually striking: the "eclipse indur'de" (line 5), the "sad Augurs" proven false in their "presage" (line 6), the end of "incertenties" (line 7), the peace and victory of "endlesse age" (line 8), and

the assurance of "Ile liue" (line 11); perhaps also, "this most balmie time" (line 9) and "My loue lookes fresh" (line 10). The phrase, "tombes of brasse are spent" (line 14), immediately recalls the doctrine of the harrowing of hell and Christ's victorious assault on the gates of brass of the lower world.[13]

(12) The second Glorious Mystery is only vaguely intimated in Sonnet CXVII by lines 7f.: "That I haue hoysted saile to al the windes / Which should transport me farthest from your sight."

Up to this point the parallels between the Mysteries of the Holy Rosary and the Shakespearean Sonnets are impressive. But Sonnets CXXVII, CXXXVII, and CXLVII, which should on this theory agree in some manner with the third, fourth, and fifth of the Glorious Mysteries, do not, as a matter of fact, do so. Yet it is probably worthy of mention that, as the last two Mysteries shift from events in the life of Christ to events in the life of His mother, the earlier Sonnets (through CXXVI) seem to be directed to a man, while those after Sonnet CXXVI seem to be directed to a woman. Moreover, since three of the Hail Marys of the Rosary are used for meditation on the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity (or love), it is rather curious to observe that Sonnet CLI has negative allusions to faith in the words, "gentle cheater" (line 3), "betraying" (line 5), and "treason" (line 6), while Sonnets CLIII and CLIV, variations on the same theme, are quite obvious allusions to (profane) love. Sonnet CLII should, of course, parallel in some way the virtue of hope, but instead alludes strongly to treachery, the opposite of faith.

Before proceeding further let us test the theory by selecting a few other Sonnets at random to determine whether they may at intervals of ten suggest the Mysteries. We may do this briefly and schematically, beginning with Sonnet I (the enumeration is that of the Mysteries as listed earlier): (1) I, lines 1f., 4, 9f.; (2) XI, lines 1, 3f.; (3) XXI, lines 6f., 11f.; (4) XXXI, no apparent resemblance; (5) XLI, lines 2, 10; (6) and (7), LI, LXI, no apparent resemblances; (8) LXXI, lines 1f., 14; (9) LXXXI, lines 1, 8; (10) XCI, lines 9-14; (11) CI, lines 11f.; (12)-(15), CXI, CXXI, CXXXI, CXLI, no apparent resemblances.

Beginning with Sonnet III we have these results: (1) III, lines 2, 5f., 9f.; (2) XIII, lines 1f., 7; (3) and (4) XXIII, XXXIII, no apparent resemblances; (5) XLIII, lines 3, 9-14; (6) LIII, line 5 (reference to Adonis); (7) LXIII, lines 3f.; (8) LXXIII, lines 2f., 5-8; (9) LXXXIII, lines 11f.; (10) XCIII, lines 5, 9f., 13f.; (11) CIII, lines 5-12; (12) CXIII, line 1; (13)-(15) CXXIII, CXXXIII, CXLIII, no apparent resemblances.

And with Sonnet X, we have these results: (1) X, no apparent resemblance; (2) XX, the entire Sonnet, especially line 2; (3) XXX, lines 13f.; (4) XL, lines 1-4; (5) L, the entire Sonnet; (6) LX, the entire Sonnet; (7) LXX, lines 2f.; (8) LXXX, no apparent resemblance; (9) XC, the entire Sonnet; (10) C, no apparent resemblance; (11) CX, the entire Sonnet, especially lines 8f., 11-14; (12) CXX, no apparent resemblance; (13) CXXX, line 1f. (the references to *red,* the liturgical color for festivals of the Holy Ghost); (14) and (15) CXL, CL, no apparent resemblances. (It is worth noting that in all four of our groups of Sonnets there are no seeming resemblances to the fourteenth and fifteenth Mysteries.)

Notwithstanding the fact that our scheme does not work with absolute precision, we are entitled, I believe, to assume that there is a similarity, however secular, of the Sonnets to the Holy Rosary. But we have yet to consider reasons for the supposed resemblance. First, would William Shakespeare, nominally an Anglican, have made allusions to what was in his day a peculiarly Roman Catholic practice? Of course the answer is, "Yes." This point requires no belaboring, having been studied quite adequately by John Henry de Groot in his thesis, *The Shakespeares and "The Old Faith."*[14] I cite only one of many appropriate remarks from his volume:

> . . . there must have been occasions when out of the deep well of the subconscious there arose reminiscences of the Old Faith—thoughts and feelings of an almost nostalgic sort which, in becoming vivid to the artist, would take him back to the house on Henley Street. Once more he would hear the voice of his mother at prayer. In her he would see a faint reflection of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God. The very name would strengthen the association. Often, through-

> out the busy writing years, bits of Catholic imagery, Catholic sentiment, Catholic tradition, slipping unawares along the channels of the imagination, would enter the main stream of the poet's creative effort and give to that stream slight shifts of direction and touches of color discernible today in the poet's poems and plays.[15]

A second reason is even more relevant. It pertains to the sonnet tradition. Hardly had the sonnet been invented (in the thirteenth century)[16] when a development of it was contrived, namely, the sonnet-sequence.[17] Here we could go very far afield in quest of origins, but a few remarks must suffice. From its earliest days monasticism had encouraged, had indeed based its worship on, the recitation of the Psalms in course. By early medieval times this practice was commuted for unlettered brothers to a comparable recitation of a hundred fifty Paternosters, and by the time of the High Middle Ages was still further varied by the substitution of Ave Marias for Psalms or Paternosters. The practice proved to be quite popular among the laity. Among literary persons there evolved by analogy a yet greater variation. Cycles of short poems or hymns in Latin, called *psalteria*, were composed, often original, but more often employing the language of the corresponding Psalms or phrases from the Paternoster or, eventually, "tags" from the Ave Maria.[18] Similar works were composed in the European vernaculars. The influence of such poetry on sonnets and sonnet-sequences may not have been direct but it was unavoidable.[19]

Shakespeare's Sonnets, however, are not religious. How, then, can they be associated with a religious background? To answer that question we introduce our third point. One of the commonest tendencies in medieval literature was toward parody,[20] whether in Latin or the vernaculars, in prose or verse, for serious purposes or profane use. One type of parody was artistic imitation of ecclesiastical texts: an example is the quaintly charming *Lay Folks Mass Book*.[21] Another type was the devotional multiplication of services parallel to the staple of Mass and Divine Office. The Rosary itself is an illustration of that. The third parodistic category includes neither the artistic, serious or profane, nor the votives, pious or superstitious, but secular imita-

tions. This category may be further divided in a twofold manner: parodies which were serious, cynical, or satirical, written in an attempt to correct abuses; and those which had no object other than humor, mockery, or simple entertainment. An example is the late twelfth-century Anglo-Norman drinking-song, "Or hi parra," which imitates the eleventh-century hymn, "Laetabundus." The extent to which parody was carried in the medieval period is almost inconceivable to us. Yet once we recognize that fact, we can understand how an utterly secular sequence might have had the Rosary as its ultimate background.

A fourth and final reason for suspecting that to be true of Shakespeare's Sonnets is the immense importance of the Rosary before and during the years in which he was beginning to write. The intricate history of the Rosary need not detain us, but a few facts must be recalled.[22] During the century before Shakespeare the Rosary devotion had been developed, spread, and popularized by such zealous enthusiasts as Dominic the Prussian, Alain de la Roche, and Henry Egher. The form was generally standardized, the Ave Maria was lengthened, and the usage of meditating on the Mysteries was added. Especially influential in promotion were organizations devoted to frequent use of the Rosary, notably the one of Cologne established by the famous Dominican, James Sprenger, co-author of *Malleus maleficarum*.[23] The Protestant Reformation served to accentuate its importance, since the Rosary was believed to be especially effective against heresy.[24]

When Shakespeare was only seven years of age, there occurred, on Sunday, October 7, 1571, that battle of Lepanto which Cervantes, Shakespeare's older contemporary, called "la mas memorable y alta ocasion que vieron los pasados siglos, ni esperan ver los venideros."[25] It was indeed a great victory, and popular opinion attributed it to processions which the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary had made that very day in Rome. The pope, St. Pius V, who only the year before had excommunicated (and deposed) Shakespeare's queen, immediately ordered a festival of the Rosary for the anniversary of the battle. In 1573 his successor, Gregory XIII, extended the commemoration as a major double to all churches in the Roman Catholic world which had

altars dedicated to the Rosary and increased the spiritual privileges attached to its use.[26] The fame of Lepanto must have been made even more vivid in England when, in 1576, the hero of the engagement, Don John of Austria, arrived in the Netherlands as the new governor. His presence just across the Channel was the occasion of many a plot to rescue the imprisoned Mary of Scotland and place her on the English throne with Don John as her consort.[27]

The year 1575, when Shakespeare was eleven years old, was a papal Holy Year or Jubilee. The persecuted English Roman Catholics could not, of course, participate in the celebration. But in order to allow them some part in the observance, Pope Gregory XIII made an exception in their case: a bull authorized a special arrangement whereby they might share the indulgences through prescribed recitations of the Rosary either in the form which has become customary or in the form called *Brigittine*.[28] Thus, whether Shakespeare ever used this devotion or not,[29] he must have been aware of its significance. And, if our analysis of the Sonnets is correct, they reflect it in a distant and thoroughly secular manner.

---

[1]This paper was read in part at a meeting of the South-Central Modern Language Association, Dallas, Texas, Nov., 1957.

[2]Cf. Allen Cabaniss, "A Note on the Liturgy of the Apocalypse," *Interpretation*, VII, No. 1 (Jan., 1953), 78-86; "The Harrowing of Hell, Psalm 24, and Pliny the Younger: a Note," *Vigiliae Christianae*, VII, No. 2 (April, 1953), 65-74; "A Footnote to the 'Petronian Question'," *Classical Philology*, XLIX, No. 2 (April, 1954), 98-102; "A Note on the Date of the Great Advent Antiphons," *Speculum*, XXIII, No. 3 (July 1947), 440-442; "*Beowulf* and the Liturgy," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, LIV, No. 2 (April, 1955), 195-201.

[3]The word *rose* appears in the Sonnets thirteen times, as follows: I, line 2 (capitalized and italicized); XXXV, 2 (plural and capitalized); LIV, 3, 6, 11 (capitalized, two plurals); LXVII, 8 (twice, capitalized, one plural); XCV, 2 (capitalized); XCVIII, 10 (capitalized); XCIX, 8 (plural and capitalized); CIX, 14 (capitalized); CXXX, 5f (capitalized, plurals). For this paper I make use of the facsimile edition published by Columbia University Press for the Facsimile Text Society (New York, 1938), thereby assuming as substantially correct the original 1609 order of the Sonnets.

[4]See the interesting discussion by R. J. Browne, "The Rosary in the *Nibelungenlied?*" *Germanic Review*, XXX, No. 4 (Dec., 1955), 307-312.

[5]Hyder E. Rollins, ed., *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Sonnets*, I (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1944), 2ln., citing Malone, ed. 1780.

[6]Luke 1:48.

[7]Luke 1:50.

[8]Cf. the early fifteenth-century English carol, "I syng of a mayden," as so penetratingly discussed by Leo Spitzer, "*Explication de Texte* Applied to Three Great Middle English Poems," *Archivum Linguisticum,* III, Facs. II, 152-164, esp. p. 156.

[9]Collect for the first Mass of Christmas: "Dominus, qui hanc sacratissimam noctem veri luminis fecisti illustratione clarescre: da, quaesumus, ut, cujus lucis mysteria in terra cognovimus, ejus quoque gaudiis in caelo perfruamur. . . ."

[10]Luke 2:35.

[11]Matt. 26:36-44, and parallels.

[12]Cf. Matt. 26:40, and parallels.

[13]Cf. Ps. 106:16 (Vulgate) and many similar passages assembled and discussed in Cabaniss, "The Harrowing of Hell, Psalm 24, and Pliny the Younger" (see Note 1 above). Leslie Hotson, *Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and Other Essays* (London: Hart-Davis, 1949), pp. 4-21, has made some very interesting observations about this Sonnet.

[14]J. H. de Groot, *The Shakespeares and "The Old Faith"* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1946).

[15]*Ibid.,* p. 157; see also pp. 2, 224, for similar but briefer statements.

[16]Ernest Hatch Wilkins, *The Invention of the Sonnet and Other Studies in Italian Literature* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1959).

[17]Cf., *inter alia,* Houston Peterson, ed., *The Book of Sonnet Sequences* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1929), viii: "Sequences of sonnets developed in Italy in the thirteenth century almost as early as the sonnet itself."

[18]The great collection, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi,* by G. M. Dreves, C. Blume, and H. M. Bannister, has in its 55 volumes (Leipzig, 1886-1922) many of the *psalteria,* showing an almost geometrical multiplicity of variations.

[19]It is possible also that there may exist an inner and more profound relation between the sonnet form and the liturgical form of prayer called the *collect.* Clarity, precision, fixity, economy, and unity characterize both. But an investigation of this possibility would require another paper.

[20]See, e.g., Paul Lehmann, *Parodistische Texte* (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1923), edited to illustrate his slightly earlier *Die Parodie im Mittelalter.*

[21]T. F. Simmons, ed., *The Lay Folks Mass Book,* EETS, Original series. No. 71 (London: N. Trubner and Co., 1879).

[22]The important work on the history of the Rosary is a part of a series of articles by Herbert Thurston on "Our Popular Devotions." He deals specifically with the Rosary in *The Month,* XCVI (1900), No. 436 (Oct.), 403-418; No. 437 (Nov.), 513-527; No. 438 (Dec.), 620-637; XCVII (1901), No. 439 (Jan.), 67-79; No. 440 (Feb.), 172-188; No. 441 (Mar.), 286-304; No. 442 (Apr.), 383-404; see also "The Names of the *Rosary," ibid., CIII* (1908), Part I, No. 527 (May), 518-529, and Part II, No. 528 (June), 610-623; also "Genuflexions and Aves: A Study in Rosary Origins," *ibid.,* CXXVII (1916), Part I, No. 623 (May), 441-452, and Part II, No. 624 (June), 546-559. Thurston has summarized his studies in the article, "Chapelet," in F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, eds., *Dictionnaire d'archeologie chretienne et de liturgie,* III, col. 399-406.

[23]In addition to the citations in the preceding Note, consult Thurston, "The Dedication of the Month of May to Our Lady," *The Month,* XCVII, No. 443 (May, 1901), 470-483; and "Notes on Familiar Prayers, I: The Origins of the Hail

Mary," *ibid.*, CXXI (1913), No. 584 (Feb.), 162-176; No. 586 (April), 379-384 (pp. 384-388 discuss the Regina Coeli).

[21]Fifth lection of Matins for the feast of the Most Holy Rosary (Oct. 7): "ut Rosarium populis praedicaret, *velut singulare adversus haereses* ac vitia *praesidium*. . . ." Italics mine.

[22]*Novelas ejemplares, prologo al lector*, in Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *Obras Completas*, ed. A. V. Prat (Madrid: Aguilar, 1952), 769.

[23]Sixth lection of Matins for feast of the Most Holy Rosary.

[24]John L. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, in *The Complete Works of John L. Motley*, IV (New York: Kelmscott, 1900), 263, 399.

[25]Thurston, "The Rosary," *The Month*, XCVI, No. 438 (Dec., 1900), 635; also "The so-called Bridgettine [*sic*] Rosary," *ibid.*, C, No. 458 (Aug. 1902), 189-203.

[26]Queen Elizabeth I is reputed to have been as devout a user of the Rosary as her sister Mary had been.

Notes on Political Poems, c. 1640

Charles L. Hamilton

THE CIVIL WARS in England and Scotland during the seventeenth century produced a wealth of popular literature. Some of it has permanent literary merit, but a large share of the popular creations, especially of the poetry, was little more than bad doggerel. Even so, one little-known and two unpublished poems such as the following are important as a guide to public opinion.

From the period of the Bishops' Wars (1638-40) the Scottish Covenanters repeatedly urged the English to abolish episcopacy and to enter a religious union with them.[1] The following poem, written very likely on the eve of the meeting of the Long Parliament, exemplifies the Scottish feeling very clearly:

Oyes, Oyes do I Cry
The Bishops' Bridles Will ye Buy[2]
Since Bishops first began to ride,
In state so near the crown
They have been aye puffed up with pride
And ride with great renown.
But God has pulled these prelates down
In spite of Spain and Pope,
So shall there next eclipse be soon[3]
In England seen I hope.
* * * *
But now brave England be thou bent

To banish all that band.
And make your Lambeth Laud repent
That never did yet good.
But shamefully hath sought the blood
Of sakeless saints of God.
Relieve your Lincoln[4] better loved
And set him safe abroad.

There is no doubt that most of the Covenanting leaders were interested in the extirpation of bishops, 'root and branch,' in England because of their belief that the prelates were the primary cause of Scotland's conflict with Charles I. Until Laud and his colleagues—the wicked councillors who surrounded their sweet prince—were removed and episcopacy abolished, the Scots leaders argued that future bishops' wars would occur, thereby undermining the Convenanters' achievements in Scotland.[5] Some of the Scots, however, had grander dreams. To them the destruction of bishops in England and Ireland was only the beginning of a crusade which would carry them to the Continent to oppose the forces of the Triple Tyrant in Rome.[6] The following poem describes Scotland and England joining to free the Irish from papal enthrallment and then marching to the aid of the Continental Protestants, especially avenging the evil done to the daughter of King James VI and I, Elizabeth, the 'Winter Queen.'

Britain and Ireland's Last Adieu
To Rome, and Babel's Cursed Crew[7]

Since Jock and Jack by happy chance/ are joined in amity:
You Popish Monsieurs march to France/ you Dons to Castalee.
Let Romish frogs return to Rome/ and mean them to the Pope:
If here they haunt, expect a doom/ no better than a rope.

* * * *

Jack use thy time and busy be/ to chase these frogs away,
And with brave Jock keep company/ who will thee lend a day
At Lyne he'll on thy service stay/ while thy well-settled be:
And for Shane's sake along the way/ to Dublin march with thee.

* * * *

And when brave Jock returns from Lyne
And Shane from Rome set-free,
Jock will with Jack march to the Rhine

The Palsgrave's bounds to see.
There to avenge the woes and wrongs
Of our Eliza fair,
Whose princely race bound down so long
Is by the Spaniard there.
* * * *
The Lord who hath this work begun.
Make it perfected be:
And when the troublous times are done
End Zion's Misery.
Amen quoth he, who prays these three
By God conjoined in unity,
May still in one Religion
Fear God, under one tripled Crown:
That Dagon[8] here as he hath been
May near God's ark no more be seen.

The events of the Long Parliament gave political poets a vast amount of subject matter. In the following excerpt, taken from a MS. volume entitled *Pasquinades,* collected by Sir James Balfour of Denmilne, the King is told how he could gain popularity.[9]

Change places Charles, put thou on Pym's grey gown,
While in the lower house he wears a crown,
Let him be King a while, and be thou Pym
Then we'll adore thee as we do him. . . .

The King had no intention of accepting Pym's demands, however, and his attitude, conflicting with that of the opposition in Parliament, brought on the Civil War. Perhaps this was inevitable, for in varying degrees, the Royalists, Parliament and the Scots, who entered the war in 1643 as allies of the Lords and Commons, all believed that they were fighting for a Holy Cause which could allow no compromise.

[1]For a statement of the Covenanters' intentions, see a pamphlet published by the Scots immediately preceding their invasion of England in the Second Bishops' War. This is printed in the *Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1640-41,* pp. 161ff.

[2]Quarto CVI, no. 118, Wodrow MSS., National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.

[3]Doubtful reading.

[4]John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln and later Archbishop of York, was imprisoned in the Tower in 1637. An opponent of Laud, Williams was popular with those who objected to the religious policy of Charles I. Williams was released in November, 1640, and he played an important role in the House of Lords during the first year of the

Long Parliament. Toward the end of 1641 he protested against the anti-episcopal behavior of the London mob. This lost him his standing with the popular party and resulted in his being returned to the Tower until May, 1642. For criticism of him in a ballad, see "The Bishops' Last Good-Night," *Cavalier and Puritan,* ed. by Hyder E. Rollins (New York, 1923), pp. 134-35.

[5]For indications of this attitude, see [Alexander Henderson] *Our Commissioners' Desires Concerning Unity in Religion . . . as a Special Means for Preserving of Peace in His Majesty's Dominions* (London, 1641).

[6]See *The Correspondence of de Montereul and the Brothers de Bellievre . . .* ed. by J. G. Fotheringham (Edinburgh, 1898), I, xiv.

[7]A printed version of this poem appears in Denmilne Papers, XII, no. 74, National Library of Scotland.

[8]Dagon: originally the Philistine fish-god, hence Roman Catholics.

[9]The volume is contained in the Denmilne Collection in the National Library of Scotland. The poem is dated November, 1642.